Regd. No. O-1

ସମାଜ
The Samaja
ପ୍ରତିଷ୍ଠାତା - ଉତ୍କଳମଣି ଗୋପବନ୍ଧୁ ଦାସ

CUTTACK, APRIL 1, 1987 PRICE Rs. 5.00 LICENSED TO POST WITHOUT PRE-PAYMENT

HISTORICAL FACTS

Relating to formation of Orissa Province, merger of Orissa States and Proceedings of the Debate held in the Orissa Legislative Assembly on the report of the States Reorganisation Commission on 26th and 28th November, 1955.

ADMINISTRATIVE MAP OF ORISSA

SUPPLEMENT TO THE 'SAMAJ' ON THE OCCASION OF THE CELEBRATION OF GOLDEN JUBILEE OF THE FORMATION OF SEPARATE PROVINCE OF ORISSA ON APRIL 1, 1936.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE DEBATE OF THE ORISSA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON THE REPORT OF THE STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION HELD ON THE 26th AND 28th NOVEMBER 1955.

The role played by Dr. Mahtab and many legislators and public men of Orissa which led to the adverse decisions of the Government of India on the legitimate claims of Orissa for inclusion of Sareikela and Kharswan as per the claims advanced by Government of Orissa. Utkal Sammilani and other organisations. Dr. Mahtab had made a definite commitment in a letter as Chief Minister, Orissa to the State Ministry of Government of India agreeing for merger of Sareikela and Kharswan in Bihar. Government of India's final decision for no change in Orissa's boundary, in contravension of previous assurances by the special enquiry committee of the Congress. The facts recorded in Orissa Assembly debate had not been contradicted.

Saturday, the 26th November 1955

MOTION

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

"The Report of the States Reorganisation Commission be taken into consideration".

Mr. SPEAKER: "In so far as it relates to the boundaries of Orissa" will this portion be omitted ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): I wish to omit that portion. In view of the fact that the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission does not only deal with the reorganisation of States but also with the public services, the constitution of Public Service Commissions, safeguards for linguistic minorities, appointment of the High Court Judges, etc., I think that it will be better to consider the whole Report by omitting this portion.

(Point of Order)

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA: This is a very important matter. This was given to us last evening in the form of a motion. On the basis of that motion we have given our amendment. If Government want to bring an amendment today to the motion notice for which they have given only last evening on the amended motion against time has to be given for amendments. We are as anxious to consider all the matters contained in the States Reorganisation Commission's Report as Government are. As the scope of the motion is being made wider, we ought to get time for making our amendments wider accordingly.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA: Speaker, Sir, what is the object of the Hon'ble Minister in bring such an amendment ? If that objective is made known, misgivings of the Hon'ble Members of the House would be removed.

Mr. SPEAKER: In addition to boundary affairs, matters relating to the Public Service Commission, High Courts, etc. have been discussed in the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. Therefore, the Hon'ble Minister thinks that if the scope of the discussion is not restricted to boundary affairs only, there will be an opportunity to discuss all the matters contained in the Report.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA: This will result in much more inconvenience. If all matters contained in the Report are discussed here, one week's time may be necessary. If only boundary affairs are discussed, then the discussions may end in two days. But if all the matters contained in the Report are discussed it will take a lot of time and quite a very satisfactory situation may not arise. Therefore, I would request the Hon'ble Minister to bring the motion in the same form as he had brought earlier.

Mr. SPEAKER: I also share the same opinion as that of the Hon'ble Member who spoke just now. If the scope of the motion is wide, the scope of the discussion will also get widened.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): Speaker Sir, before the Central Government arrive at any decision on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, they are eager to know the views on the Report of the different State Legislatures. They have also requested the State Governments to get the Report considered in their Legislatures by the 30th November 1955 and forward the proceedings of the debate to the Government of India. Hon'ble Members must have been aware that this Report will be considered in the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha in the second week of December. In this Report not only matters relating to the boundaries of States but also about reorganisation of some States, unification of some others, formation of new States, safeguards for the linguistic minority communities, integration of services, and financial and other administrative measures have also been discussed. Therefore, when the House is going to consider the Report and it is felt that attention should also be paid to such important matters, I have widened the scope of this discussion in consultation with the Leader of the House so as to enable the Hon'ble Members to consider matters not only relating to the boundary of the State but also to express their opinion on the other matters referred to in the Report. Of course, it does not follow that Hon'ble Members have to express their final opinion only within these two days. If necessary, other dates may be fixed for consideration of other matters. But care has to be taken to see that the Government of India or the Parliament do not carry an impression that apart from expressing opinions on boundary the Orissa Legislature had nothing else to say on other matters. That is why, I have amended my motion by withdrawing the words "relating to the boundaries of Orissa". Boundary of this State which is now the burning topic will, no doubt be discussed. But let the motion be in such a form that all matters discussed in the States Reorganisation Commission's Report can also be discussed here. The States Reorganisation Commission have raised some points which are matters of high policy and fundamental principles on which Government of India would wish to know the opinion of the State Legislature. I would, therefore, request the Hon'ble Members to agree to my amended motion. If Hon'ble Members wish to bring further amendements to this amended motion, the Speaker may, of course, permit them to do so.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : After hearing all sides of the matter I feel that we are now placed in a dilemma. Government have stated that before the 30th of November we have to inform our views to the Central Government. What views or opinions can be expressed in the course of the discussions on this motion that is now before us ? If the Assembly discusses on any definite proposal and gives its opinion then only we will be in a position to inform that such and such is our opinion and it may be taken into consideration by the Government of India. Speaker, Sir, are you going to send copies of all the speeches to the Central Government or copies of the discussions on a specific proposal ? Therefore, what is the object behind this proposal and how are our views going to be communicated and what will the Government of India understand from them ? Let this matter be placed before the House for consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER : If opinions have to be communicated, they may be in the form of motions. Otherwise, Hon'ble Members may also express their opinions in their speeches and those will also be sent. It is not that we are compelled to adopt a motion. Opinion of the House can be communicated in a motion or printed proceedings of whatever is spoken can also be sent.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : We are not discussing here only for the sake of discussion because Government have said that the Government of India want to know our opinion. Therefore, will the Assembly give its opinion or individual menbers their individual opinions ?

Mr. SPEAKER : The Hon'ble Member may give his opinion in the form of a motion or in any other form.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : I would like to know from the Government as to why instead of bringing a definite proposal before the House for expression of its opinion Government have brought a motion in this form ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): The Hon'ble Member may give a proposal in the form of an amendment so that apart from boundary matters opinions on other matters can also be expressed.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : Speaker, Sir, this leads me to certain misgivings. The original motion was that matters relating to our State boundary were to be discussed. Now the amended motion is that the entire States Reorganisation

Committee's Report will be considered. Besides the Government Memoranda other Memoranda were also submitted. There is no mention of these in the amended motion. As a result of widening the scope of the motion, discussion on boundary affairs will be shortened. Whatever attention boundary affairs would have drawn will now be restricted or limited even though we may be aksed to consider only on boundaries. I feel that people will interpret it as not being the deisre of the Minister that emphasis should be placed on boundary matters. It is never our intention that our discussions on boundaries should be limited or restricted and at its cost discussions on other matters extended. It is true that the Report contains several matters which deserve consideration. But in our case the boundary question is the biggest question. We should discuss on it. We do not want that the scope of the motion should be widened.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): It is a matter of regret that the Hon'ble Member from Banpur has misunderstood the whole thing. (Voice—Does he always misunderstand ?) I do not say that. But still I would say that he has invariably misunderstood this matter. I know he has been a seasoned legislator of long experience and I am extremely sorry that the Hon'ble Member from Banpur has misinterpreted the motion which I proposed to move inasmuch as he says that by amending the motion I am rather side-tracking the issue of boundary which is far from my mind and far from the mind of my Government. As a matter of fact that was originally the intention of the motion which I gave notice of. But since it was brought to my notice that the Central Government have asked the Government of Orissa to place this Report of the States Reorganisation Commission before the Legislature for its consideration and to supply copies of the entire proceedings of the debate to them so that they may consider the same in formulating their proposal for the consideration of the parliament, I thought it better in consultation with the Leader of the House to widen the scope of the motion so as to include not only the question of boundry, which is the burning problem in our State, but also other matters which have been discussed in the Report. If there will be any definite opinion of individual members, parties, groups or the House as a whole on the States Reorganisation Commission's Report they will be forwarded to the Central Government if recorded in the proceedings so that they will consider the whole position. With that end in view. I propose to amend the motion. I again repeat that it is not true that we do not attach greatest importance to the problem of the boundary which has been the most important subject before us. When on behalf of the State Government I deputised for the Chief Minister at the Chief Ministers' Conference on the 22nd and 23rd October last and accompanied the President of the Utkal Provincial Congress Committee as a member of its Working Committee to appear before the Congress High Command, the High Power Sub-Committee, we could not deal with any other point except the boundary question. That has been the only topic which we have so far discussed. We have given our opinion so far only on this topic, as the main problem is the question of boundary. We do not intend side-tracking the issue. If, however, we do not discuss the other matters of the Report here and now our case may go by default. I think it is open to the House either to discuss or not to discuss those matters. There is no question of widening the scope for nothing; but if we circumscribe the scope some difficulties may later on arise. There are some matters which are very cognate to reorganisation of States. Supposing there remain certain areas which are not included in Orissa and there might be Oriya-speaking minorities left there, their difficulties will have to be looked into and some solution should have to be found out. The Commission has dealt with such problems and suggested some solutions. Those may be taken into consideration and some definite opinion may be offered. It would, therefore, be unwise to circumscribe the scope in our motion. I have already stated, Sir, that the entire proceedings of the debate of the Assembly will have to be forwarded to the Government of India. That is the instruction we have received.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : Will the proceedings be translated into English or will they be sent in Oriya ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): I do not know exactly. They wanted 40 copies of the printed proceedings within 7 days after the completion of the debate so that they may study them.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : The main reason, it appears to me, for bringing this amendment to the motion, notice of which was given yesterday, is to avoid the amendment that has been proposed by one of the Adibasi members of the Treasury Benches for the formation of a Jharkhand State. We do not want that this motion should come before us. But that does not mean that our attention should be distracted from the real problem before us. It is not that I did not understand these things. Why do the Government want to side-track the boundary question and the discussions on it ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): Sir, I am rather surprised at the remarks of Hon'ble Member from Banpur. As a matter of fact, I did not know that any Jharkhand motion is being moved in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER : I do not know if any other amendment has been tabled.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): It is not difficult to know the Government's stand before the States Reorganisation Commission. We had submitted three memoranda before the Commission and we stand by them even now. So where is the question of misunderstanding our position ? We are not going to wriggle out of the position which we had taken at the initial stage., because it is so vital to us, it is a life and death question to us. So why should we be misunderstood because of certain individuals having contemplated somethings of which we have no knowledge. I am sorry. things which are beyond our control, are being utilised for insinuating against us.

Mr. SPEAKER : From the constitutional point of view, the motion for which the Hon'ble Minister has given notice may not be brought by him or may be brought in an amended form. I accord my permission to the amended motion which has now been brought and if any further amendment in respect of that motion is brought I am prepared to accept it.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : For this let some time be given to us. We are faced with inconvenience. Whatever amendment we would propose, we would give it in the form of a specific proposal so that the original motion as well as these two amendments can be considered at one time. Otherwise, many Hon'ble Members may like to give their views on this motion. We wish that they should know of our amendment before they do so.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): I shall have no objection, if time is given to the Hon'ble Members, so that they may table amendments if they like.

Mr. SPEAKER : This discussion will take place for two days. Members are free to experess their opinion on the motion that is now before us. Unless it is absolutely necessary, I do not propose to adjourn the Assembly any further.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : This is a very important matter. We are trying to give our amendment. It will be better if after hearing our amendment the Hon'ble Minister speaks on the motion. We may, if necessary, sit in the evening an hour longer.

Mr. SPEAKER : What time would the Hon'ble Minister take ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) : Whatever time is given to me I shall speak. If the Hon'ble Members so desire. I would now only bring the motion and shall reserve my speed to the end of the debate.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : One hour's time may be given for this, because we will give our amendment to the motion and then it will be cyclostyle and distributed to the Members. For this an hour will be necessary.

Mr. SPEAKER : The Assembly will sit at 2 P. M.

(Interval for lunch)

Mr. SPEAKER : Motion moved that "the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission be taken into consideration".

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) Mr. Speaker, Sir, ...

Mr. SPEAKER : I would like to indicate before the Hon'ble Minister starts that the motion that has come up for consideration today as well as the proceedings of the day would be submitted to the Government of India and the Parliament may hold discussion on the basis of the proceedings. So it would be convenient if the Hon'ble Members speak in English instead of in Oriya. If it is not possible, we shall make arrangements for their translation into English. But it would be better if the Hon'ble Members choose to speak in English.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : I would request the Hon'ble Minister to speak in Oriya because the people of Orissa are anxious to know it.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to speak a few words about the motion that I have moved. I would respectfully invite the attention of the Hon'ble Members to the very undesirable and unhappy situation created in different parts of the country as a result of the S. R. C. Report. While therefore discussing the Report of the S. R. C. in this House we should so express our feelings that while putting forth our case firmly and clearly we should exer-

cise necessary restraint so that no hostile feeling towards our neighbouring States or people may be expressed. I hope the Hon'ble Members will not misunderstand me. The Prime Minister of India, who presided over the Chief Ministers' Conference held on the 22nd-23rd of October last, obesrved in his inaugural address that some States in India appeared to be behaving as though they were at war against their sister States. In the course of his remarks he made reference to Orissa. The reason was that in a public meeting in Cuttack some days back the Report of the S. R. C. had been burnt. While expressing regret at this incident, he said that everyone had the right to put forward his claims firmly and it was also proper to do so. But if such ugly situations were created, they would produce unfortunate repercussions among the public. He further said that the purpose of reorganisation of the States was not to disintegrate India. The first consideration should be to uphold the unity of India. Viewed from this standpoint we should consider how far this reorganisation would help towards this end and how far our discussion would be helpful in this respect.

In this context the Commission have considered different aspects of the question in some detail. While, therefore, requesting the Hon'ble Members on behalf of Government to discuss the Report I would, first of all, invite their attention to the fact that the Commission have laid down some well-considered principles. From that point of view, there is no doubt that they have considered the matter impartially. But we have to see how far the principles laid down by the Commission have been applied in the case of various States. It is not necessary for me to raise the question of any other State but I would submit that in the case of Orissa those principles have not been properly applied.

The Hon'ble Members are aware that there were three distinguished sons of India on the Commission. Shri Fazl Ali, who was once the Governor of Orissa, a Judge of the Supreme Court, the Chief Justice of the Bihar and Orissa High Court and who intimately knew this State was the Chairman of the Commission. Pandit H. N. Kunzru, who is a member of the Rajya Sabha and whose impartiality could never be questioned and Sardar K. M. Panikar, who is a renowned Historian and a great Statesman,we the two other members of the Commission. When these three eminent persons were in the Commission, we hoped, and it was natural for us to hope, that their recommendations would be based entirely on just and reasoned considerations. They had no affiliation with any political party. Though the Congress has been in power both at the Centre and in the States, the Congress Government instead of appointing men from their own party selected and appointed persons who did not belong to any party, who were impartial and commanded confidence and respect of all and who had knowledge, partriotism. far-sight and outlook in this matter. But it is a matter of deep regret that the Chairman of the Commi-ssion has written at the end of the Report, "It should be mentioned that owing to my long connection with Bihar, I have refrained from taking any part in investigating and deciding the territorial disputes between—

(1) Bihar and West-Bengal; and (2) Bihar and Orissa".

The Chairman of the Commission has not thus taken any part in the discussion with regad to the boundary disputes between Orissa and Bihar. It means that only two members of the Commission have considered the boundary disputes of Orissa and Bihar. Most humbly I would submit that how far it was correct on principle should be judged by those who are competent to do so, but as a lay man I should think that when the Commission was set up, it was recognised that the Chairman and the other two members will take part in all their deliberations regarding matters coming under the terms of reference and the joint decisions of all the three should be treated as the recommendations of the Commission.

From the non-participation of the Chairman it would appear that the dispute between Bihar and Orissa was so delicate that even the Chairman of the Commission felt that he should not commit himself in this regard. It may, however, be recalled that the Chairman himself and another, member of the Commission, Hon'ble Pandit H. Kunzru, hail from Uttar Pradesh but that did not deter them from taking part in matters relating to Uttar Pradesh. I should, therefore, think that it was not because the Chairman was interested in Bihar or Orissa that he did not participate in matters relating to this State, but because he probably considered the matter to be very delicate. But I would most respectfully submit that the two honourable members who took up the responsibility of making recommendations on such an issue did not attach as much importance to it as it deserved nor paid adequate attention to it. There is a verse in English.

"Multiplication is vexation,
Division is bad,
The rule of three doth puzzle me,
The practice drives me mad".

We have really been puzzled by their findings. The idea of implementing them makes us almost mad. A number of memoranda were submitted on behalf of the State Government, public bodies and individuals. Had the Commission thoroughghly examined those documents, argued out the points raised by us, pointed out how the claims made by us were unacceptable in terms of the principles laid down by them, we would have no cause to complain even if their decisions would have gone against us. But it is regrettable that nothing like that has been done, in the Report. I would say that there have been serious omissions and commissiones on the part of the Commission in relation to Orissa's claims. I would quote from the Report some of the principles laid down by the Commission for referrences by the Hon'ble Members. They say in para. 111 of their Report:—

"111. In the Chapter dealing with the implications of the linguistic principle we have examined at some length the question of finding an equlibrium between the regional sentiment and the national spirit. Here we shall briefly indicate the basic considerations which should govern our approach to the problem:

"(i) an essential feature of our social fabric is undoubtedly a wide variation in our life within the framework of a broadly united culture. This, however, does not mean that diversity is a pre-requisite for unity or that over-emphasis on diversity will not hamper the growth of the national sentiment;

"(ii) in a vast country like ours, govened by a federal constitution, centrifugal forces are not unnatural phenomenon, but what is important is not that they should be eliminated, but that such forces must not be allowed to impede the achievement of our national unity; and

"(iii) the strength of the nation is undoubtedly the sum total of the combined strength of the people of the component States. But while the building of contented units, strong enough to bear their share of the burden, is an important objective, it is no less necessary that the links between the units and the nation should be equally strong so that under the stress of regional loyalties, the Union does not fall apart.

"112. It follows that, while internal adjustments at State level are to be desired, it is imperative to ensure that these do not lead to maladjustments at the inter-State and national level. From the point of view of national unity, therefore, reorganisation has to aim at a twofold objective:—

(a) firm discouragement of disruptive sentiments such as provincialism or linguistic fanaticism; and

(b) consistent with national solidarity, provision of full scope for the unhampered growth of the genius of each group of peoples".

They have observed that national unity could be maintained through the united strength of the different linguistic areas and States of India. So while contemplating the reorganisation of the States they supposed that such arrangements would be undertaken on all-India level as would afford full scope for the development of different communities and areas. It is to be born in mind that this should not lead to linguistic separatism endangering the unity of India and its solidarity. On the otherhand, arrangements have to be made for full development of the genius and strength of the component parts of India as a result of which the entire country would be strengthened and stabilised. As regards nationa security they have said, "A fundamental pre-requisite of national security is the unity of the country. What promotes unity, therefore, also strengthens security. Other considerations which we have to keep in mind from the point of view of national security are—

"(i) it is of great importance that the composition of administrative units should not assume a form which might foster regional communal or other narrower loyalties in any section of the armed forces of India and thereby undermine their undivided allegiance to the Union of India;

"(ii) in strategic areas where effective or direct central control is necessary, the administrative structure as also the measure of autonomy given to the people, should be governed by the consideration of national security; and

"(iii) another factor relevant from the point of view of national security is the size and resources of the border States. While the primary responsibility for defence arrangements must be that of the Central Government a considerable burden relating to security arrangements must be borne by the State. It is, therefore, important that a border State should be a well-administered, stable and resourceful unit, capable of meeting the emergent problems arising out of military exigencies. This means that normally it would be safer to have on our bor-

ders relatively larger and resourceful States rather than small and less resilient units".

They have said in paragraph 162 of their Report. "We now summarise our final views on the role of language as a factor bearing on the reorganisation of States. After a full consideration of the problem in all its aspects, we have come to the conclusion that it is neither possible nor desirable to reorganise States on the basis of the single test of either language or culture, but that a balanced approach to the whole problem is necessary in the interest of our national unity".

In this connection they have said in page 46, paragraph 163, "Such a balanced approach would appear to be:—

"(a) to recognise linguistic homogeneity as an important factor conducive to administrative convenience and efficiency but not to consider it as an exclusive and binding principle, overriding all other considerations, administrative, financial or political."

They have also observed in paragraph 117 of their Report: "The question that has caused the greatest controversy is the position to be accorded to language in the reorganisation of the States of the Indian Union. One of the major facts of India's political evolution during the last hundred years has been the growth of our regional languages. They have during this period developed into rich and powerful vehicles of expression creating a sense of unity among the peoples speaking them. In view of the fact that these languages are spoken in well-defined areas, often with a historic background the demand for the unification of such areas to form separate States has gathered momentum and has, in some cases, assumed the form of an immediate political programme. The Resolution appointing this Commission makes a specific reference to the importance of language. A careful examination of the pros and cons of this problem is, therefore, necessary as an essential preliminary to the consideration of the question of the reorganisation of States.

In paragraph 163 of the Report they have recognised that the areas which have a common language, homogeneity, geographical contiguity, communication and economic balance and may be related with one another administratively, socially and culturally might be formed into one State. That is what we hold necessary and they admit it. This was also included in their terms of reference. But here we have to consider whether they have taken these points into consideration while deciding the case of Orissa, and while dealing with the claims of the other States .I would submit that the Commission did not take these factors into consideration while deciding the case of Orissa while elsewhere they did. For instance, they have recommended the creation of a new State, namely, Kerala. As they have said at page 86, paragraph 303 of the Report, "The prospective Kerala State will thus consist of the existing State of Travancore-Cochin less the five Tamil taluks of Thovala, Agastheeswaram Kalkulam, Vilavancode and Shenkotta plus Malabar district which includes the Fort Cochin area, the Kasargod taluk of South Kanara district and the Amindiv Islands".

That means they have held that the five Tamil-speaking areas should not be included in the proposed State of Kerala as they have linguistic homogeneity and geographical contiguity with the Madras State and hence they have recommended that these areas should be included in the Madras State. Referring to the proposed Kerala State they have said: "It will be linguistically homogeneous; about 94 per cent of its population will be Malayalam-speaking and the State will be geographically compact. It will be well-versed from the point of view of communications".

As regards Karnataka they have said, "the territorial limits of Karnataka, as thus proposed, broadly cover the Kannada-speaking areas, but in the case of one or two small units, linguistic considerations have been subordinated to other compelling reasons".

From these it would appear that they have taken different areas to constitute the Karanataka State on the basis of language and geographical contiguity. They have taken these factors also into consideration while reorganising other different States.

They have further observed that it would not be proper to divide a district on the linguistic consideration alone. Referring to the Tamil-speaking areas of Travancore-Cochin State in this connection, the Commission in paragraphs 291 and 292 of their Report say:—

"291. In our scheme of reorganisation, we have adopted the district as the basic unit for making territorial readjustments. This is because we feel that districts have developed an organic and administrative unity and an economic life of their own, and any adjustments below the district level, therefore, should normally be avoided. If any such adjustments are considered necessary, they should be made only by mutual agreement. We have departed from this rule only when for ensuring geographical contiguity or for some other important administrative or economic considerations, detachment of part of a district has become imperative.

"292. The demand for Tamil-speaking taluks has a history behind it and has assumed a form that prejudices the political and administrative stability of this area. We have, therefore, considered it necessary, in the special circumstances of this case, to examine the Tamil claims to these taluks and to make recommendations about their future".

From this it will be seen that where linguistic and geographical considerations require division of a district, the Commission have not hesitated to recommend it and they have recommended splitting up of a district for the purpose of including a portion thereof in a neighbouring State. As a further illustration, they have recommended the inclusion of Purulia subdivision of Manbhum district of the State of Bihar into West-Bengal as 55 per cent of the population of this area are Bengali-speaking. In that connection they have said in paragraphs 665 and 666 of their Report:—

"We must, however, take note of the fact that even according to the 1951 Census, the Bengali-speaking majority in the rural areas of Purulia will be about 55 per cent (as against 28 per cent of the Hindi-speaking people) if the Chas revenue thana, which is contiguous to Dhanbad is excluded.

"666. Considering the circumstances referred to above in which the West-Bengal claim to Manbhum has been made, we propose that the Purulia sub-district excluding the Chas thana should be transferred to West-Bengal".

Similarly with regard to the district of Bidar of Hyderabad they have said at page 108, paragraph 392: "The entire district of Bidar has been included in Hyderabad State on the same principles. This is a multilingual disrict, in which Marathi, Kanada, Urdu and Telugu are spoken respectively by 39,28, 16 and 15 per cent of the population. Administratively, Bidar has very close links with Hyderabad and even Telengana at the present time."

Lastly they have said: "......Consistent with our general view that districts should not be broken up, except when compelling reasons for doing so exist, we have recommended that Bidar should not be disintegrated merely in order that linguistic claims in the north-west or in the south may be respected. We consider that it should remain with the residuary Hyderabad State'.

That means would remain a part of Telengana. They have grouped these with Telugu-speaking areas for geographical and other compelling reasons although Marathi, Kanada and Telugu are spoken by 39,28 and 15 per cent of the population respectively. What we are to consider is whether the principles thus enunciated by them have been adhered to in the case of Orissa. The case of Singhbhum may be cited here. The Hon'ble Members have already received copies of the memorandum submitted by the Government of Orissa and they know our claims made therein. In the memorandum we have put forward claims over Seraikela, Kharswan, Singhbum, Phuljhar, Bindra-Nuagarh, Chandrapur, Bastar, Budarsingh, Mandasa, Jalantar and have referred to Midnapur of West Bengal. The two Members of the Commission who came here congratulated us for the three memoranda that we submitted to them, as they expressed that there were no ill feelings or insinuations aginst anybody and that they were factual.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : They did not give you anything because you were so nice.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): One Hon'ble Member remarks that our object has been frustrated on account of our restraint. Does he mean to say that if we had used unrestrained language better results would have followed ? In this connection I would submit ....

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : I have not said that had we picked up quarrels better work would have been done. What I have said is that the work was not done on account of our memorandum being too good.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): I will now present certain facts about Singhbhum. The population of the district is 1,481,000. Out of this, according to 1951 census figures the number of Oriyas is 298,000 while the number of Hindi-speaking people is 213,000, Hos. 413,000 and the Bengali-speaking people are 268,000. It would thus be seen that leaving the Hos, the Oriyas form 20 per cent of the population and the Hindi-speaking people number fourteen per cent although according to the 1931 census their number was only 8 per cent. It has been observed by the Registrar-General of Census of India at page 42 of the Census of India, page I of 1954, that "out of the total population of 14.81 lakhs in Singhbhum district, 1,92 lakhs were found to be immigrants at the 1951 census

and of this 1.80 lakhs have come from Hindi-speaking areas". This would show that out of the total Hindi-speaking population of 2,13,000, only 33,000 (2.13—1.80 lakhs) are Hindi-speaking local inhabitants in Singhbhum district as against 298,000 Oriya-speaking who are permanent residents.

It would be interesting to quote again the Registrar-General of Census of 1951 who says: "The comparatative statement given above shows that the number of Oriya speakers to the total population is practically the same as in 1931. Ho and Santhali have lost ground to some extent. This is largely due to migration of Hos and Santhalis to the tea districts of Assam and also to some extent to Mayurbhanj now in Orissa". It shows that Oriya is the largest single group. It has been pointed out that although the Telugu-speaking people in Bidar is only 15 per cent, it has been recommended to remain in Telengana because of its geographical contiguity to Telengana. In Singhbhum the Oriya out number other linguistic groups. It has direct communication with Orissa. It is geographically more contiguous to Orissa than to Bihar. The Hos and the Mundas are mainly found in Singhbhum district and they have close relations with the Hos and Mundas living in the neighbouring districts of Orissa. From the Census of 1901 onwards it is seen that the Hos of Singhbhum have a tendency to migrate towards the south of Singhbhum in Orissa. Under these circumstances how could the S. R. C. say that the district of Singhbhum could not be transferred to Orissa ? If all the principles formulated by the Commission are applied to this case, anybody can see that it would go in favour of its wholesale merger with Orissa. Singhbhum is connected with Bihar by a single road, but it is connected with Orissa by as many as nine roads. This remarks of the O'Donnell Committee in this respect do not hold good now. Then the feudatory States intervened between Singhbhum and Orissa. So there was difficulty in communication and contiguity. Now the position is entirely changed. The representatives of the Hos of Singhbhum demand inclusion of the area. in Orissa. This has been conclusively proved in the last election in Seraikela. In course of our recent discussion the Chief Minister of Bihar demanded holding of referendum on the question. But a referendum had already been held in Seraikela constituency and Shri Mihir Kabi was elected solely on this issue. When this was pointed out to the Chief Minister of Bihar we were told that the two rival candidates taken togehter had secured more votes than Shri Mihir Kabi. But this is not correct. Shri Mihir Kabi contested in the last general elections on this issue of transfer of Seraikela to Orissa and came out successful securing 14,237 votes whereas his four rivals together polled only 13,821 votes. It is thus evident that Shri Mihir Kabi was returned by an overwhelming majority there. It is also clear that the Adibasis are in favour of joining Orissa. But the Commission have referred to the O'Donnell Committee's Report and have pointed out that the Hos were opposed to inclusion in Orissa then. But the Hos have already given their verdict in 1952 that they want merger with Orissa. This very important aspect has been completed ignored.

What is the position in Singhbhum Sadar and Seraikela subdivisions ? According to the Census of 1951, the population of these areas number 870,743 and the area is 3,308 sq. miles. Of the total population, Oriyas number 154,088 and Hos number 396,984, thus making a total of 551,072 which means they are in overwhelming majority in the areas. Hindi-speaking people in these areas number 58,187 and Bengali-speaking 74,127 and most of the Hindi-speaking people are Immigrants. Almost all the Hos are found mostly in these areas and in the neighbouring districts of Mayurbhanj, Sundergarh and Keonjhar of Orissa. There are no Hos in any appreciable number in Bihar outside Singhbhum. In the Census of 1931, there were only 104 Hos in Bihar outside Singhbhum. This number has gone up to 4,520 in the Census of 1951, as many Hos have gone to the mining areas temporarily for employment. But in Orissa the number of Hos is 220,000. If the Sadr and Seraikela subdivisions of Bihar are integrated with Orissa almost all the Hos will be brought under one administration and their number will come to 620,000 and there will remain only 17,000 Hos in Bihar including those of Dhalbhum. But if the Hos remain divided as at present in the two States what would be the consequence ? Discontent would grow amongst them and this may lead to trouble in future. They have economic and social affinities only with Orissa. They mostly depend on Orissa in respect of communications, lands, supply of food and other articles of everyday use. Secondly, together with Oriyas they forms the overwhelming majority in that area. Even if Dhalbhum, in parts of which the Oriyas are in majority, is left out, the Sadr and Seraikela subsivisions form one compact area and fulfill all the requisite conditions for merger with Orissa. Dhalbhum will not remain an enclave if Sadr and Seraikela sub-divisions minus a small portion in the north-west corner of Seraikela subdivision is transferred to Orissa. There is no reason why it should not. The Commission have not advanced any strong or convincing arguments against its merger with Orissa. We thought that better counsel would prevail and the wrong committed by the O'Donnell Committee would be set right after 22 years under the altered circumstances, but the contrary has happened.

Similarly, in the case of Oriya-speaking areas of Madhya Pradesh, those old arguments have been invoked in the altered circumstances of today to deny justice to Orissa. In Phuljhar in Madhya Pradesh the Oriyas numbered 44 per cent according to 1931 Census. Now it has gone upto 53 per cent according to 1951 Census. But this has not been taken into consideration by the Commission. The Madhya Pradesh Government have transferred the excise administration of a tract called Sankara to Orissa since 1911. We submitted a separate memorandum urging amalgamation of this area. But the Commission have not made any reference to it at all.

Claims on behalf of Orissa were also made in respect of four tahsils of Bastar district, namely, Jagadalpur, Kondgaon, Dantewara and Konta comprising an area of 6,881 sq. miles with a population of 65,587. In the district taken as a whole, the Oriyas form 10 per cent of the population but the Hindi-speaking people are only 4 per cent and the Telugus 8 per cent. But their number is proportionately much less in the area of those four tahsils, the percentage of Oriyas being much more than either the Hindi-speaking or the Telugu-speaking.

The Gonds and the Murias, who are the largest number of inhabitants of that area, are only found in the neighbouring district of Koraput in Orissa and nowhere else. So the transfer of this area to Orissa is fully justified. Andhra raised claims over Bastar and the Commission while dealing with the case of Madhya Pradesh rejected those claims on the ground that Koraput is not included in Andhra and therefore the claim cannot be entertained. Although Bastar has close affinities with Koraput and Jagadalpur, its headquarters is only 10 miles from the borders of Orissa, and all its trade and business is with Koraput. The Commission have rejected Orissa's claim over those areas.

Had the Commission justly and thoroughly considered our claims, we would have nothing to complain, But this not been done. What surprises us most is that the Commission, while discussing the question of Seraikela subdivision in paragraph 625 of their Report have said : "Those speaking this language (Oriya) do not seem to be concentrated anywhere within the sub division to such an extent that lingusitc affinities can be regarded as clear and unmistakable". But this is not correct. Even if we leave aside the question of Seraikela and Kharswan towns, Oriyas in the rest of the subdivision number 33.3% whereas the percentage of Hindi-speaking people including the immigrants is only 16. This is according to the Census of 1951. The O'Donnell Committee while referring to the Census of 1931 in respect of Singhbhum district had said:

"The figures for each subdivision are as follows:—

Sadar subdivision—	
Primitive and others	381,129
Oriya, Bihari, Bengali and "doubtfuls"	154,078
Dhalbhum—	
Primitive and others	206,801
Oriya, Bihari-cum-Bengali and "doubtfuls"	187,794

"It should be noted, morever, that the "doubtfuls" include, as already mentioned, Bauris, Ghasis and Pans, who are undoubtedly primitives by origin.

"(2) In regard to the Oriya and the Bengali-cum-Bihari elements, there is a clear cut division between the Sadar and the Dhalbhum subdivison of the district.

"(a) In the Sadar subdivision (where the Bengali are negligible) the Oriya greatly outnumber the Biharis, The figures are as follows:—

Oriyas	89,631
Bihari-cum-Bengali	16,997
"Doubtful"	47,450

"The Oriya preponderance is marked not only in the subdivision as a whole, but in each one of the local units with the exception of the extreme north-west corner of the district and the municipal areas of Chakradharpur and Chaibassa."

At last they had said:—

"It will be seen that if most of the 'doubtfuls' were assigned in Singhbhum to the Biharis-cum-Bengalis, and in Dhalbhum to the Oriyas, the Oriyas would still have a substantial majority in Singhbhum, and the Biharis-cum-Bengalis in Dhalbhum."

It would be clear from the Census Report that "Bauris",

"Ghasis" and "Pans" belong to Oriya scheduled castes. Yet they were grouped as "doubtfuls" and thus the number of Oriyas was reduced. In spite of this the O'Donnel Committee had admitted in para-10 of their Report (Vol.I) that the Oriyas were in a majority everywhere in Singhbhum. In the face of these facts it is not under-stood on what grounds the Commission have recommended retention of this area in Bihar and how they could say that the Oriyas are nowhere concentrated.

The Commission have quoted another statement of the O'Donnell Committee, who had then stated, "Hos were opposed to a man" to inclusion in Orissa. But at present there is no reason for any opposition by the Hos. They are rather anxious to be with Orissa.. Out of the twelve -M.L.As of Singhbhum seven along with others submitted a memorandum to the States Recorganisation Commission wherein they stated that as at the time of the O'Donnel Committee some Feudatory States intervened between Singhbhum and the Orissa districts the Hos thought that they would not be under one administration on account of this lack of geographical contiguity. After the integration of the Feudatory States however the position, has completely changed. Now they demand merger with Orissa as they can come under one administration with the rest of the Hos who are found only in Orissa. As already pointed out in the last General Elections Shri Mihir Kabi, M.L.A.. was elected to the Bihar Legislative Assembly on this issue·

Shri ACHYUT MAHANAND : Which party set him up :

Sri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) : Ganatantra Parishad. Even the 34 Adibasi M. L. As of Bihar belonging to the Jharkhand Party in their memorandum before the States Recorganisation Commission specially mentioned that they would not like to remain with Bihar. One of their leading members, Shri Sidui Hembrom and five other "Ho" M.L.As. urged the States Recorganisation Commission to include Singhbhum in Orissa in their evidence. It is surprising that the Commission have not even mentioned this fact in their Report. Even after the publication of the Report of the States Recorganisation Commission those M.L.As of Bihar on the 11th October last sent a memorandum to Hon'ble Prime Minister, the Hon'ble Home Minister of India and the Congress President demanding merger of Singhbhum with Orissa. They sent copies of that memorandum to the Chief Minister of Orissa and many M.Ps. They are reported to have in the meantime personally represented these facts before the Union Home Minister and the Congress President.

Shri HARIHAR DAS (Aska) : Who else expressed their opinion in favour of Orissa ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) : The Communist Party of Bihar. The Singhbhum District Congress Committee also submitted a written memorandum urging merger of Singghum with Orissa.

Hon'ble Members are aware how a devastating flood overtook Orissa this year all on a sudden. Among the major rivers of the State are the Mahanadi, the Brahmani, and the Baitarani. There are also rivers like Suveranarekha, Budhabalang and Salandi. The catchment areas of Brahmani and Baitarani and Salandi are in Singhbhum district. The tributaries of these rivers traverse Chotanagpur-Singhbhum. For the effective control of these river systems, this catchment area should be under the control of Orissa State. A dispute has arisen between the States of Bihar and West-Bengal regarding the Kasai river. From this point of view Singhbhum should not be kept separate from Orissa thereby giving rise to a similar problem in future. From the political consideration Singhbhum where Hos and Oriyas together predominate should be integrated with the neighbouring areas in Orissa where Oriyas and Hos also predominate.

Dhalbhum originally was a part of Midanapore. Subsequently it was included in the district of Manbhum. Shorty after that Singhbhum district was formed by tagging Dhalbhum to Kolhan (Porahat) in Singhbhum and by including four "Pirhs" from Mayurbhanja, four "Pirhs" from Seraikela and one from Kharswan. In the year 1947 the Maharaja of Mayurbhanj in a memorial to the then Viceroy and Governor-General, Lord Mountbatten, demanded return to Mayurbhanj of these four "Pirhs" which had been included in Singhbhum. In the year 1829 the Zamindar of Ghatsila (Dhalbhum) entered into an agreement with the Commissioner at Cuttack in which the area was described as "in the Province of Orissa". In 1879 Sir A. Eden passed orders for introduction of English and Hindi languages in the courts of Patna Division in Bihar as against Persian. But he ordered that the "Kaithi" script should be used. Sir Edward Iliot later on ordered in 1894 that Hindi language in "Kaithi" script would be introduced in Chotanagpur also.

It would thus be evident that in Singhbhum as also in Chotnagpur Hindi has been forcibly imposed only 50-60 years back, whereas for centuries past this area (Singhbhum and part of Manbhum) had been connected with Orissa alone. It may be noted that since 1905 till 1920 large number of British Officers, such as Sir Edward Gait, Mr. Foley, Mr. Garret, Mr. Philip and others had made repeated proposals that Oriya should be the medium of instruction and court language in Singhbhum and that by introduction of Hindi a wrong has been done to the majority of the people. It was even then suggested to transfer Singhbhum to Orissa Division. In 1941 when the Utkal University was newly established in Orissa and Hon'ble Member from Banpur was then the Minister for Education, the two ex-States of Seraikela and Kharswan were transferred from the Patna to the Utkal University on the ground that they were Oriya-speaking States and it would be difficult for the Patna University to conduct examinations through the medium of Oriya. Then there was not only no objection from Bihar side but they themselves agreed to such transfer. When the other day at Delhi this was mentioned by us, the Chief Minister of Bihar said : "Yi chhotis bat the, is liyei kuchh kaha nahi."—"It was a small matter so we did not say anything". When in 1916 these two States were placed under the Political Agent of Orissa there had never been any objection from Bihar, but now they say it was a small matter. Then why objection to this "small matter" now ? My submission is this matter should be considered in an impartial way. We do not want to create any quarrel with our neighbouring sister State. If we indulge in such conflicts amongst ourselves the unity of India may be affected. We should go ahead shoulder to shoulder with our sister States and with a comradely spirit. There must be perfect harmony amongst ourselves. As a matter of fact, if there is any State which has cooperated with us in having a separate Province, it is Bihar. The late-lamented Dr. Sachidananda Sinha of Bihar was the first to move resolution to that effect in the Imperial Legislative Council of India. We could therefore have no quarrel with our sister State Bihar. But the question of inghbhum and Seraikela is such a vital matter that we are bound to assert our legitimate claim and demand justice. We have to put forward this claim in emphatic terms. We hope we will not be misunderstood for doing so. Our regreat is that the Commission did not go into these matters.

The principles and conditions regarding language, culture, etc., laid down by the Commission in creating new States and adjusting boundaries of some States, have unfortunately not been applied in respect of this State. We have, therefore, made our representations to the Government of India. I would earnestly appeal that the Hon'ble Members should discuss this matter in a dispassionate manner, without any bitterness whatsoever.

There are various other matters that have been discussed in the Report, such as abolition of Part B and C States, reducing the number of States from 32 to 16 of one class only, abolition of Rajpramukhas, constitution of Public Service Commission, safeguards for the linguistic minorities, etc. It is hoped that this House will give due attention to these problems and record its opinion. I would again respectfully remind that if we indulge in mutual conflicts amongst sister States and thereby misdirect the attention and psychology of the people there may be danger to the very unity and security of India in view of the complicated international situation. We must assert our view-points and claims with determination dignity and patriotism. Let there be no rancour or no insinuations in our deliberations.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : We want to know if our Government have placed anything new before the Union Government or the High Power Sub-committee.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) : I had already said about it.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : What is the result ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): That I cannot say.

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : What is the Government's stand with regard to the southern areas ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): That has been included in a memorandum comprising three big volumes and submitted to the Central Government. The Prime Minister has acknowledged receipt of the same.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : In respect of which areas more emphasis has been laid ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) : More empha-

sis has been laid on Seraikela. The two subdivisions of Singhbhum district and Phuljhar, Bastar, Bindranuagarh, Sankara etc., in Madhya Pradesh because we have unassailable grounds on them.

Shri GODAVARIS MISHRA : I would like to know if the two Ministers and some top ranking leaders of Orissa, who have placed Orissa's claims in Delhi during the last two or these weeks, have laid claim to the outlying Oriya tracts to the south of Ganjam which once formed part of Ganjam district but were excluded on the recommendations of the O' Donnel Committee. Have they raised any question with regard to it ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) : All this has been included in the memorandum. We have also given special reasons in respect of these areas.

Shri GIRISH CHANDRA RAY : If in the Chief Ministers' Conference held at Delhi any letter regarding the giving away of Seraikela to Bihar Government by Shri H. K. Mahtab was produced on behalf of the Bihar Government.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) : No, nothing of the sort happended in the Chief Minister's Conference.

Mr. SPEAKER : I have gone through all the amendments which have reached me and among them I find that the amendment No. 2 by Shri Nishamani Khuntia and Shri Dibakar Patnaik and amendment No. 7 by Shri B. K. Pani are quite admissible. But with regard to the other amendments given by Shri P. K. Deo, Shri N. C. Pati, Shri Gangadhar Paikray and Shri Gokulananda Praharaj some portions, as far as I understand are inadmissible. Now I read those portions. In Shri P. K. Deo's amendment the objectionable portion is "failing which the members of the Assembly along with the Ministers and officers should resign." In Shri Narayan Pati's amendment the inadmissible portion is "failing which the members of the Orissa Legislative Assembly along with the State Cabinet should resign forthwith".

Similarly in Shri Godavaris isra's amendment the inadmissible portion is as follows : "and decides that, as a measure of constitutional protest, the members of this Assembly including the Ministers and the Officers thereof, do resign their seats under Article 190 (3) of the Constitution of India and calls upon the members of the Council of State elected by this Assembly and advises the members of the House of People representing this State also to resign their seats under Article 101 (3) (b) of the said Constitution so as to be able to make that protest effective". In Shri Gangadhar Paikray's amendment the inadmissible portion is as follows : "This House further calls upon the members of all parties in the Assembly to stand united in pressing forward the agreed demands of the people of Orissa".

But lastly in Shri Gokulananda Praharaj's amendment the inadmissible portion is "and if the said demand is rejected the Cabinet along with all the members of the Orissa Legislative Assembly should resign". The portion that they should resign, would not be admissible as I think. I have not arrived at any definite conclusion. Those who have some knowledge in this matter, may give some advise.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA: I would like to ask before that whether the amendments are arranged in order of their admissibility and inadmissibility in the List of Amendments or not. I find my amendment motion appearing at the bottom. I think, I submitted the amendment motion before notice of any other amendment was given but I see my amendment appears at the bottom and those of others given notice of after my notice appear at the top. I have nothing to say if the relative position is determined by ballot but if it is determined in any way other than ballot, I think the relative positions are determined in the order of their admissibility.

Mr. SPEAKER : Nothing has been done like that. I cannot say which of them came in what order. The second amendment is admissible but there is another amendment to that and it seems to be inadmissible.

Shri NILAKANTHA DAS : One a point of information It is not clearly understood as to what you mean.

Would the amendment be out of order as it makes mention about officers and members of the Parliament; and if these words are omitted would the amendment be in order ? What is the point of apprehension ?

Mr. SPEAKER : I think the whole portion is out of order.

Shri GODAVARIS MISHRA : It is a matter of regret that I am speaking from this side and the Hon'ble Member from Satyabadi is speaking from the other side. Although I am unable to follow him exactly, I think, as there is mention of officers and ministers, he apprehends that that would be inadmissible. The Hon'ble Speaker and the Dy. Speaker although are members of the Assembly enjoy quite a different status for which I have mentioned them in my amendment as officers. Further I have mentioned about ourselves as well as those who have been elected to the Parliament and also about those to whom we have sent to the Parliament.

Shri NILAKANTHA DAS : I am very sorry that my words could not be understood. I was spaking the same thing what he said. All our officers, ministers and members will tender resignation. But does it become out of order when members of Parliament and outsiders are included in it.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : Hon'ble the Speaker, I can not say what is admissible and what is not admissible. It is not within my sphere. But I think, we have the right to say that let our members resign. Let those who have been elected by us resign and those who have been dected by votes from this State also resign. We have the right to say this. This Legislature is all powerful. We can frame any rule or resontion within scope of the present constitution. So I do not think that this is beyond our power. We are making legislation on the strength of the legislative list. We are acting in all fields in accordance with that list. Accordingly we have the right to recall those who have been returned by election. So I think it will not be correct on your part to say that it is unacceptable.

Shri GOVINDA PRADHAN : Hon'ble Speaker, the amendment given by the Hon'ble Member Shri Gangadhar Paikray is that all parties of this House have uanimously agreed to put pressure on the Union Government regarding our demands. Will it be objectionable ?

Mr. SPEAKER : The Hon'ble Member from Banpur has said about the submission of resignation by the member of this House under clause 190 (3) (b) of Constitution. Of course the members have got their right to resign but after the Assembly is constituted the members desiring to resign should indicate their desire in writing to the Speaker.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA: You may remain for a day and accept the resignation of all and then yourself quit. The whole process can be done even in five minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER : Then whoever resigns will resign at his convenience. How all the resignations will be received at a time ?

I doubt if a constituted body can be dissolved by passing a resolution. Of course the Hon'ble Members can resign individually. However I want to know the opinion of the Law Minister on the matter.

Shri SATYAPRIYA MOHANTY (Minister) : Mr. Speaker, Sir; This House has power to pass any resolution. But it is not a fact that all the resolutions can be executed legally. The resolution in question is not appropriate from legal stand point. We have no power what-soever to dissolve an elected body by adopting a resolution in this House. If a member does not resign after adoption of this resolution in the House, who can compel him to do so. This resolution can be passed by votes of the majority. But what can be done in case the minority group decides not to tender resignation. In my opinion this resolution is unconstitutional and as such carries no importance.

Mr. SPEAKER : This is a motion and not a resolution. In a resolution certain recommendations are generally made to the Government. But this is a motion distinguished from a resolution. I therefore think that it cannot be acceptable.

Shri NABAKRUSHNA CHOUDHURI (Chief Minister) Speaker Sir, what the Hon'ble Member of Banpur suggests to do cannot be done within the powers given in the Concurrence List, Union List or the State List of the Constitution. I am very much doubtful if it can be done within our legislative competency. For this is a matter on which we all are more or less of same opinion although efforts are being made to create a difference of opinion.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : Speaker Sir, if you have any doubt it will be better if you take the advice of the Advocate-General The advice of those among us who do legal practice will be of no avail. The opinion of every member of this House is of equal importance to you. It will therefore be better if the advice of the Advocate-General is taken on the issue in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. SPEAKER : I may call the Advocate-General if I think that I cannot arrive at any decision without taking his opinion. I thank the Hon'ble Member for the advice given by him. I would have done this even if the Hon'ble Member had not given such advice.

Shri V. SITARAMAYYA : Mr. Speaker Sir, I feel that the last portion of the resolution moved by the Hon'ble Member from Banpur relates to the resignation of the members of the Assembly. It cannot be admitted for the following reasons. The resignation of the members of the

Assembly is a matter on which Government has nothing to do, because a resolution has only to draw the attention of the Government on matters of public issue.

POINT OF ORDER

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : Here I raise a point of order. You have explained it already that this is a motion and not a resolution. The Hon'ble Members is going to speak on the matter taking it for a resolution. So now you may kindly tell him effectively that it is a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER : This is a motion.

Shri V. SITARAMAYYA : Even if it is a motion, it requires the decision of the Assembly. Rule 111 of our Assembly Rules says— "A matter requiring the decision of the Assembly shall be brought forward by means of a question put by the Speaker on a motion proposed by a member.

A member who wishes to move a motion (other than a motion for which a specified period is otherwise prescribed) shall give notice of his intention to the Secretary two days in the case of a motion of an amendment and fifteen days in the case of other motions before the meeting at which he intends to move the motion :

Provided that the Speaker may, in his discretion, admit at any time any motion at shorter notice than that prescribed in these rules, or may admit a motion without notice.

Rule 114 also says that "(1) An amendment must be relevant to and within the scope of the question to which it is proposed. (2) An amendment may not be moved which has merely the effect of a negative vote. (3) After a decision has been given on an amendment to any part of a question an earlier part shall not be amended unless it is ancillary to, consequential on, the decision.

My submission to the House is that so far as the last portion of the amendment is concerned it wants all the members of the House to resign. It is a matter which this House cannot decide. The decision of the House cannot be enforced on the members and Government can not accept it. Under the Constitution the Assembly as a whole or the members put together cannot force any member to resign. If my voters ask me to resign, I may resign, even than I am not legally bound. I therefore submit that so far as resignation of members is concerned. this House has no right to ask anyone to resign much less a group of members can ask another group of members to resign. So this portion of the amendment cannot be admitted. If this is admitted tomorrow a member may bring another resolution asking the members to resign on some other issue. We are here to work out the Constitution and not to go against it. The House itself by passing a resolution cannot dissolve it. Individual members by using their discretion can resign their membership. A resolution of this House can have no effect to force the members to resign. The mover of the motion can only show to the outside world that he is asking the members to resign, but they are not resigning.

Shri GIRISH CHANDRA ROY : A short period notice can be given for introducing a motion whereas in the case of a resolution a long notice has to be given. Generally recommendations are made to the Government through a resolution. But the interpretation made by the Hon'ble Member is totally a different thing.

Shri GADADHAR DUTTA : The motion in this regard has three-fold purposes. The first is that the members of this Assembly should resign; the second is that the members in the Lok Sabha and Council of State from Orissa should resign and the third is that Officers should resign. But we should remember that paragraph (b) of clause (3) of Article 190 of the Constitution says that any member desiring to tender his resignation should send his resignation in writing to the Speaker. It has no connection with that. When this Assembly met for the first time we all have taken oath to bow to the Constitution. This Assembly is constituted under the Constitution and according to the Constitution the members of the Legislature have no right to dissolve the Legislature. As such if we all resign then we will be acting against the Constitution and I think we are disregarding the provisions of the Constitution thereby. As for the second one the members of this Assembly have no right to ask the members of the Parliament representing the State to tender resignation. Then with regard to what has been said about officers, it is to be borne in mind that they have also taken oath. This motion may be appropriate to be discussed in a public meeting but not among the members of the Assembly. I, therefore, hope that you may rule out the motion as out of order.

Shri HARIHAR DAS (Aska) : Wherefrom the opinion of the pleaders do come ? It is only when they go through the papers of the party and hear in full the details from the party that their intelligence works.

Mr. SPEAKER : The Hon'ble Member cannot speak anything by way of comment regarding what the chair said about pleaders.

Shri HARIHAR DAS (Aska) : I am a member of this House for the last four years. You have given me a legal tender to participate in the discussions with regard to legislation and I am doing that. I will say something with whatever knowledge I have gained therefrom. We have got the right to discuss certain matters in this House and to arrive at conclusions. and there are certain other matters which are outside our scope. We cannot discuss a motion the ultimate purpose of which is to be executed by the Government of India and we have no powers to execute it.

We can discuss on a motion that can be executed by us. This is a motion that can be executed by us. Why can we not discuss on such a motion ? Supposing this motion is adopted and all the members tender, resignation except four. In that case it will be printed in the proceedings that such and such four members did not resign and people will know them. We have got the right to discuss this and you cannot prevent us from that.

Mr. SPEAKER : As I said, I think that this House has the right to ask the members from Orissa in the Council of State to resign as it is their electorate.

Sri NABAKRUSHNA CHOUDHURI (Chief Minister) This is not the correct view, as the Assembly elects them according to the principle of proportional representation. By this procedure the different arties and even the minority party in the House can elect their candidate by means of single transferable vote. But it would not be constitutionally correct to tell them to resign by a resolution passed by the majority party in the House. Because of the provisions in the Constitution for proportional representation by which the party in minority can also send their candidates, there will be no meaning of this provision if the majority party can ask them to resign.

Mr. SPEAKER : The Hon'ble Chief Minister will certainly agree that the members of this Assembly are their electorate.

Shri NABAKRUSHNA CHOUDHURI (Chief Minister) : If all the members would have jointly elected them, then it would have been reasonable, but as a metter of fact the election would not be valid if the majority party votes for all the members to be elected by the House by means of single transferable vote. Their election would be valid only when the parties get the chance for proportional representation. Therefore the majority party has no right to ask the candidate elected by the minority party to resign.

Shri NISAMANI KHUNTIA : Mr. Speaker Sir, The point under discussion in the point of order raised by you with regard to this motion is how can it be executed, if adopted. At some place the language is 'do resign and at some other place request has been made to resign. In the motion tabled by me, which is admissible according to you, I have said to urge upon the Parliament. The Parliament is not bound to accept if this motion is adopted here. Similarly the people are not bound to accept our advice even though we are their representatives. We are going to appeal only and not going to pass a legislation. In the same manner we who have constituted this Assembly do feel that it will be proper to resign on this issue. The apprehension of somebody who may not tender resignation does not arise. This is no law to be binding on everybody. We are only expressing a feeling.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : I did not think that there would be so much of controversy on this simple issue. You know that students who fail in the examination, try to commit suicide. A person suffering from heavy loss in the business jumps to the sea and courts death. Many commit suicide on the failure of their cases in courts. Along with other States we also made certain claims before the Commission. The claims of all including West Bengal, Assam, Madhya-Pradesh etc., were accepted whereas our case was dismissed. Therfore it will be natural on our part to commit suicide. Let us all tender our resignations. It will not be proper if we do not resign for fear that others may not resign. The claims of all were met but we have got nothing. I think it will be better on your part to consult the Advocate-General in the matter. His point of view will be accepted by you.

Shri RADHANATH RATH(Minister) : The Hon'ble Member from Banpur said that the claims of Orissa were rejected, but Bihar also claimed three of our districts and that

was not accepted. Demand was made for United Maharastra but they have not got it. So it will be improper to say that injustice has been done to Orissa only.

Shri ARJUN DAS : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the point under discussion is whether the motion tabled by Shri Godavaris Misra should be discussed in this House or not. Those who object to it, offer the argument that such a motion canot be given effect to, if adopted. Therefore, according to them only those motions that can be executed by this House are to be admissible. But there is no test like this according to constitutional law. As for example on many occasions the different legislatures pass laws that are subsequently held to be ultra vires by Courts and declared void. By that the law can no longer be operative, but the proceedings of the Assembly containing the discussions on the law do not become void. A law to become void means that it cannot be enforced. So there is no illegality in expressing opinion in this House through a motion, resolution or legislation. It may not be enforced if we are not able to enforce it by means of constitutional law and the practical effect of that will end there.

However, in this case it may be seen from one side that the Orissa Legislative Assembly is a corporate body and this body has got the privilege of expressing a combined opinion on every matter. The State Governments can make laws and enforce them according to the powers given to them under the List appended to the Constitution but this House, as occassion so requires, can express its total opinion from time to time on subjects which are not enumerated in that list. The motion by the Hon'ble Member from Banpur here is merely the suggestion that it will be better if the members of this Assembly and Parliament act in such and such manner. If this view is accepted by this House, it will be taken as the view of the House as a whole and not of any individual member. As such the question of one member insisting an another member to tender resignation does not arise. If it is adopted it will mean that this House as a whole accepted it. At this situation I feel that there is no constitutional bar to express views that such and such class of persons should act in such manner.

Mr. SPEAKER : I gave my ears to what many Hon'ble Member said but nobody has said as to how this motion can be workable.

The members will submit their resignation to the Speaker. The Speaker will also resign as he is also a member. Why should he wait until all the members have resigned. This motion therefore, can not be workable. Secondly the members have got full rights under the Constitution to resign, but I do not think that a motion to dissolve the statutary body is in order. Therefore the portion "do resign" will be I nadmissible.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : We are unable to accept your ruling. As a mark of protest we will stage a walkout and come inside the Hall after a minute or two.

(At this stage all the members of Opposition except Shri Dibakar Patnaik walked out of the Hall).

Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK : I want to move an amendment . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER : I take it for granted that all the amendments are moved except the portions to which I have refused consent.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : We did not know that you allowed it excepting the last portion.

Mr. SPEAKER : Now all the amendments are taken t o be moved.

The following amendments were moved:—

1. Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : At the end of the motion—

Add "After consulting the report this Assembly is strongly of the opinion that Seraikela and Sadar subdivisions and Bahadagad police-station of Dhalbhum sub-division of Singhbhum district in Bihar, Seraipalli, Basna, Mainpur and Deobhog police-stations in Raipur district, and whole of Bastar district in Madhya Pradesh, Ichhapuram Tahasil including 60 Oriya villlages of Udayanakhanda, Dubarsingh, Jalantar, Mandasa, Tarala, Tikkali and portions of the Zamindaries of Chikati and Parlakimedi in Andhra, Parvatipuram, Salur and Palkonda agencies of Srikakulam district, Sujankotta Mutha, Gangaraj Madgol, Paderu, Arakku, Viravalli and Surnga Varapu Kota agencies in Visakhapatnam district of Andhra be included in the State of Orissa."

2. Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK : At the end of the motion—

Add" and the Parliament be urged upon to accept the demands put forth in the memoranda submitted by the State Government to the States Reorganisation Commission in full in spite of the recommendations of the said Commission to the contrary.'

3. Shri NARAYAN CHANDRA PATI : At the end of the motion—

Add" and the Parliament be urged upon to accept the demands put forth in the Memoranda submitted by the State Government to the States Reorganisation Commission in full.'

4. Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : At the end of the motion—

Add" and having considered it, this Assembly regretfully comes to the conclusion that the Commission have signally failed to do justice to the claims of Orissa and properly to appraise the points, reasonings and arguments raised and adduced not only in the Memoranda submitted by the Government of Orissa, but also in those submitted by other competent public bodies and persons and by the different political parties in Orissa and the areas of the neighbouring States affected by the findings and recommendations of the Report of the Commission."

5. Shri GANGADHAR PAIKRAY : At the end of the motion—

Add "After due consideration of the report this House welcomes the abolition of the Rajpramukha and Part-C States and welcomes the formations of certain new provinces. This House however highly deplores the fact that the States Reorganisation Commission has not accepted the cardinal principle of linguistic homogeneity at the basis for the formation of the States and adjustment in boundaries.

This House rejects the States Reorganisation Commission report as far as it concerns Orissa.

It recommends to the Government of India for the inclusion of Sadar sub-division and Seraikela sub division of Singhbhum district of Bihar and further recommends the readjustment of Orissa's western and southern boundaries on the basis of linguistic majority and contiguity taking village as the unit."

6. Shri GOKULANANDA PRAHARAJ : At the end of the motion—

Add "and the central Government be urged upon to accept the demands put forth in the memoranda submitted by the Orissa Government regarding Orissa Boundaries to the States Reorganisation Commission in full in spite of the recommendations of the said Commission to the contrary.'

7. Shr BIJAY KUMAR PANI : At the end of the motion—

Add"While appreciating and accepting broadly the general principles on which the States Reorganisation Commission have passed their recommendations in their report for the solidarity and Naional Unity of India such as:—

(1) One class of States in the whole country
(2) Abolition on the office of Rajpramukhas
(3) Safeguards for protecting the interests of linguistic minorities.

This Assembly notes with deep regret and disappointment that the Commission has completely ignored the claims of Orissa so far as the readjustment of its boundaries is concerned. A perusal of the recommendations reveals that the Commission have not given any consideration to the facts and arguments advanced by State Government in their memoranda in regard to this matter.

This Assembly, therefore, urges upon the Government of India to review the recommendations of the Commission in the light of the just and legitimate claims put forth by the State Government in their memoranda and take such measures as are necessary to readjust the boundaries of the Orissa State so as to integrate with it the areas claimed, particularly, the Sadar and Seraikela subdivisions of the Singhbhum district in Bihar the Phuljhar Zamindary area (Mahasamunda Tahasil A), Bindhra-Nuagarh (Deobhog), Sankara tract and four Tahasils of Bastar, namely Jagadalpur, Kondgaon, Dantewara and Konta in Madhya Pradesh.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : We all know what amount of disappointment the Report of the Commission has caused all over Orissa. I presume the Ministers have felt it as deeply as the general public. The public have expressed their disappointment and consequent resentment on hundred platforms. Some reference has been made to one undesirable incident in the expression of resentment by the public. The Hon'ble Finance Minister has referred to it in his speech. He has said that to burn the Report has been an indignified act. He has also said that the authorities in Delhi did not take it well. It is perhaps natural for them to take that view of the incident. But our Ministers by having hung down their heads when the incident was pointed out to them have

held up our honour. They could have acted otherwise, they could have given the authorities in Delhi an altogether different version. They could have told them that the grief and disappointment of the people has been so immense that not to speak of burning the Report, they might have gone to the extreme point, no one can say, what it might be.

Shri NABAKRUSHNA CHOUDHURI (Chief Minister) : People of other State did many things, but our Oriyas could not do more than setting fire to the cover page of the report. Bravo indeed

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA: Who can say whether it is the outer cover which has been burnt or the first page or the 125th page is all immaterial.

Shri NABAKRUSHNA CHOUDHURI (Chief Minister) : I say this as I know it definitely.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : Why does the Hon'ble Chief Minister try to pounce upon spots of dirts like the dirty fly ? Why does the cast his looks on filth ?

Shri NABAKRUSHNA CHOUDHIRI (Chief Minister): The nasty people are making dirts around them for which it is necessary to guard them.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : The Commission have done injustice to Orissa in their deliberations. We did not know whether they have done this under the pressure of circumstance, or they have not read the whole thing, or to please some one or for any other reason. They have said that they did not know that the Hos of Singhbhum are anxious to come away to Orissa. But 15 days back the Hos in their Memorandum have demanded for merger in Orissa. They have tendered evidence, called meetings and did all that they could do to achieve this. In spite of that if any body pleads his ignorance to the fact that the Hos are in favour of merger in Orissa, then that will be a serious blunder. Our Finance Minister said that we should speak in respectful language. He has spoken in respectful language. For this the aim could not be achieved. Probably our language become so respectful that all turned deafears towards us. We are also going to use the same respectful language over our present disappointment. A single page of the Report was burnt and that has been raised in the discussion. I proposed an amendment to the effect that let us all resign, so that it will have pressure on the Government. If we sit tight and do not do any work it will create deadlock. This is the only constitutional way I wanted you to adopt. There is no doubt that there are persons of very high order in the Commission. I cannot say if efficient and wise people always do the correct thing. The attributes of the wise consist in their capacity to cut down a poisonous tree within 2 days whereas 50 ordinary people could hardly finish it within 10 days. Accordingly, they will require no time to cut down a good thing. The Finance Minister said in his speech that he did not appreciate certain actions of the members of the Commission. He spoke this very politely. I would also like to speak in the same respectful language. Shri Fazal Ali, the Chairman of the Commission, remained aloof towards the end. He said that he will not give any opinion with regard to the boundary disputes between Bihar and Orissa and between Bihar and West Bengal. Was he not aware before accepting the chairmanship that he will have to say something in this regard ? But what is the reason of remaining aloof like this ? He could have resigned from the Commission and that would have been better. Instead of doing that why he left the whole matter to the decision of two members of the Commission ? He was our Governor. But he remained silent over our matters. He said "you better do whatever you like, and I am not saying any thing".

A Judge may say that he cannot decide a case in which his brother is implicated. But is it a case in which his brother is implicated ? Did these people act like Judges in a Court ? It was a Commission and it was going to do an important work. I think the Hon'ble Finance Minister will certainly agree that what I said are in courteous language. The members of the Commission opined that the memorandum submitted by the Government of Orissa was in a respectful language. The Hon'ble Finance Minister said that the Commission have praised us for our decorous language, and that is the reward we received, no matter whether the outlying Oriya tracts are merged in Orissa or not. Was it sufficient to say that the memoranda were written in courteous language ? I do not understand why the Hon'ble Finance Minister said this.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) : They did not say anything about courteous language. On the other hand they said that the memoranda were factual.

Shri GODAVARIS MISHRA ; There is nothing to be self complacent in their appreciation of our factual presentation of memoranda. As regards the question raised by the Finance Minister as to whether our goal could have been achieved by rebuking, I should say that our goal could not have been achieved by rebuking but it could have been achieved only if they could have known that we had the power to rebuke. Some snakes do bite but people do not go near a snake that frightens with a hiss but does not bite. Had we behaved like that snake which hisses and shows its fury without the capacity to bite, I believe, we could have achieved our ends to some extent.

While going through the report of the Commission one would curiously mark where the first sentence at its page 99 begins. The sentence reads like this : "The last of territorial units in respect of which proposals for reorganisation have to be considered is Orissa". But why the case of Orissa has been taken up at last ? Did the Commission visit Orissa at last ? Is Orissa the smallest among all States ? What can be the reason for considering the case of Orissa at last ? There is a story in this connection which runs like this. Once upon a time a King distributed certain articles on the occasion of the death anniversary of his father. It became evening but distribution was not over. He ordered those who didnot receive anything to come on the next day to receive their shares. Persons such as Shri Rath, Shri Mohanty, Shri Patnaik, etc., who were in the forefront received the presentations made by the King. But persons such as Dasia Naik, Ramo Kandara and others who were on the back and could not receive anything were asked to come on the next day. Accordingly, they also made themselves present as directed by the King. But to their great astonishment the King said that he did not know that every thing was exhausted in the previous days distribution and as such he had nothing to distribute further. The Commission have behaved with us in a similar manner. They took up our case for consideration as the last one. Who asked them to consider our claims in the last after making distribution in respect of others ? And what has been its consequence ? At last they have recommended for the merger of Purulia with West Bengal. Since they had decided that Purulia should go over to West Bengal, they could find no way to recommend for the merger of Sareikela and Kharaswan with Orissa. But why did you at all decide like that. You had altogether forgotten the case of Seraikela and Kharaswan while taking this decision. If you had recommended for the integration of Purulia with West Bengal you should have left a corridor through Purulia and that would have satisfied the Biharies. The Oriyas would also have been satisfied. Instead of doing that they recommended for the merger of Purulia with West Bengal and when our claim was raised they said that in the absence of a suitable corridor it is not possible to accede to your claim. They say that if Sareikala and Kharswan were transferred to Orissa there would be no direct communication between Dhalbhum and Bihar. But where is the necessity for such a direct communication ? As a matter of fact Dhalbhum belongs to Orissa. As the Hon'ble Finance Minister said historically Dhalbhum was once a part of Orissa. Even now the highest percentage of population of Dhalbhum is in the order of (i) Oriyas, (ii) Bengalees, (iii) Biharees and (iv) people speaking other languages. Thus it would be seen that the Oriya speaking population form the majority. So where lies the difficulty to transfer this tract to Orissa ? Where does the question of providing a corridor to Bihar arise ? We do not know from which stand-point the Commission have considered these matters. But it is a fact that they have paid the least attention to the claims of Orissa.

The Commission have said another thing which when told by an ordinary man would have gone under the description as being shameless. But since Commission have said it, it cannot be described as such. The Commission have said that they did not find sufficient reasons to merge the Singhbhum district with Orissa. They have quoted the report of the O' Donnell Committee on he strength of which they arrived at such decision. Twenty five years ago the O'Donnell Committee had reported against the merger of Singhbhum with Orissa and that we also admit. It is to be ascertained what he said Committee made such recommendations. It might be that the British Government wanted them to make such recomendations in consideration of the political motive changing from time to time. It was suspected that the British were out to create a separate State of Jharkhand and keep that under their control. But now it has been decided finally by the authorities that there sould be no such State as Jharkhand. No body wants to create new problems in the country by bringing such a new State into existence. But why did the

Commission bring in the O'Donnell Committee Report. The past reasons for agitation no longer exists. This opinion is shared by the Hon'ble Finance Minister as well as the Hon'ble Members of the House. I therefore need not explain it further. But it was not proper on the part of the Commission to reject Orissa's claim on Singhbhum on the strength of the O'Donnell Committee Report.

Moreover I apprehend that the Commission have tried to do certain things which might have been a fit matter to be done under the British regime. They have said certain things in connection with disintegration of Singhbhum from Chotanagpur which it is very much apprehanded would give rise to the question of formation of Jharkhand State in future. At page 169 and in paragraph 619 of their report they have said that Bihar's biggest Thermal Power Station is also located at Bokharo in the Jharkhanda area". In other words they recognised the existence of Jharkhand. It would have been a different thing if they had said that it was located in the area claimed by the Adibasis for the Jharkhand State. But by saying "in the Jharkhand area" they recognised the existence of a separate Jharkhand State. On one hand they have recognised Jharkhand and on the other hand they have said that Singhbhum cannot be disintigrated from Chotanagpur area. Whether the Commission a:tually wish it or not does not matter much. But what I apprehend is that they have provided a weapon in the hands of Mr. Jaypal Singh, who will say "Look here, we will hope henceforth to establish Jharkhand with Singhbhum as its integral part." Had it not been so, some members of the Assembly who belong to the Congress party would not have raised here the question of a separate Jharkhand State. The report of the Commission provides them a ray of hope that some day the Jharkhand State may come into existence.

Another thing that strikes me is that the manner in which the Ho Community is being treated with, some day they would completely be wiped out. Mr. Speaker Sir, you would see as the Hon'ble Finance Minister has said that the total strength of the Ho Community outside Singhbhum and Orissa is 4,500. They are not to be found anywhere else in the world except in the district of Singhbhum and in Orissa. Many of those, 4,500 Hos are to be found in Ranchi District. They do earth-work. i.e., digging soil. They went from Orissa to dig soil in some parts of Ranchi where they temporarily settled up. But Ranchi is not the original home of the Ho Community. It is Singhbhum which is the original home of the Hos. If Singhbhum is merged with Orissa the Hos would gradually proceed to the south to settle up. What is seen is that they are coming away to the southern parts due to ill-treatment towards them in the North. An officer of the Government of Bihar whose name of course I do not recollect at present gave evidence before the Simon Commission that it was not possible on the part of Hos to settle up in the Bihar State permanently due to the oppression of the Biharees who were a fighting community. Now the Biharees give slogans to the effect that so long as the swords of Mungher and lathis of Sahabad were under this possession none could offer a fight to them. The Hos gradually retreated towards the south in fear of such lathi charge. In course of time they are coming away from Chotanagpur and Singhbhum to Orissa as a result of which matrimonial relationship has been established between the Hos of Orissa and Singhbhum. Now the Hos fully have realised the importance of the solidarity of the linguistic group to which they belong. They therefore try to get their areas integrated with Orissa. Their future can hardly be predicted at present. The Hos are cultivators by profession and they are the children of the soil. Land is of utmost importance to them which they require for cultivation. There is no suitable agriucultural land in areas such as Chotanagpur, etc., which are of course rich in mineral resources. The Hos are coming to Orissa as they get here cultivable lands. They are coming away to Orissa because they get lands here. Further, the Hos have linguistic affinity with the Oriyas and they have also love and sympathy towards the Oriyas. The Ho language and the Oriya language are coming gradually close to each other.

Moreover, the Commission have not at all tried to understand the question of Sareikela and Kharswan. Then how could they examine the documents and papers relating to those areas. It is doubtful whether they have throughly examined the memoranda and other papers placed before them. It is not known what they understood while taking evidence here. But the Commission while taking the evidence are reported to have expressed their view before some people at least two persons whom I know, that Orissa would get Sareikela and Kharswan. What happened thereafter God knows alone. It is one of the wonders of the world how their views changed subsequently. The Commission prepared the report after having decided to give Sareikala and Kharswan to Orissa. But why such changes were made in the Commission's report perhaps you can now understand it. It is reported that the Commission had read out the report to a certain Bombay Minister Mr. Hiray before its publication. Subsequently there had been last hour's change in the report with regard to Bombay, If it was possible in the case of Bombay, it was also equally possible with regard to Bihar.

Perhaps, likewise they might have read out the report to some prominent person of Bihar. It might be for that reason that they would have felt the need for changing the report. There was no means of knowing what was submitted in the memoranda prepared by our Government because they were kept under lock and key. That memorandum was a voluminous one. That is why some officers of the India Government were reported to have asked the Government of Orissa as to why they submitted such a voluminous memorandum, who will have the patience to read it. We understand that they have now submitted another short memorandum.

Shri KARUNAKAR PANIGRAHI : The West Bengal Government submitted a memorandum much bigger in size than ours.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : Bengal is a big State. The members from Balasore first get their inspirations from Bengal. The Commission have considered what sould be the disadvantages to Bihar if Sareikela comes to Orissa and what would be the advantages if it is retained, in Bihar. But they have not considered what would be the advantages and disadvantages to Orissa in regard to Sareikala and Kharswan, and also the Commission have stated in page 170 of the report :

"As has been pointed out elsewhere in this report, language, by itself, does not. in our opinion, provide sufficient justification for breaking up a district."

They were not willing to split up Sareikela and Kharaswan for the sake of Singhbhum district but what they have done with regard to Manbhum district ? But what they have done in the case of Santal Praganas and also in several cases in other parts of India. They have split up the areas whereever they desired it to be so but where they have not so desired they have advanced arguments against the principle of splitting up. The Commission have stated in another part of the report that "Above all in view of the recommendation which we make in the next Chapter for the transfer of part of the Manbhum district to West Bengal, the transfer of Sareikela subdivision or any portion thereof, to the State of Orissa will convert the Dhalbhum sub-division in the east into an enclave which will not be physically contiguous to the rest of Bihar".

They would have given a way to Dhalbhum by splitting up Sareikala and Kharaswan. It is not known why they have not done in that manner.

It is emphasised that Sareikela and Kharswan have more connection with Chotanagpur. Whether Sareikela and Kharaswan had close relation with Chotanagpur for a pretty long time could be known from the study of History. If there had been a Historian amongst the Commission's personnel, the Commission could have known that the relation of Chhotanagpur with Sareikala and Kharaswan was accidental and not an established one.

With regard to the areas claimed for merger with Orissa from the Madhya Pradesh the Commission have said as follows:—

"In case of Phuljhar and Bindhra-Nuagarh areas of the Raipur district, the O' Donnell Committee found overwhelming public support for their retention in the present Madhya Pradesh."

The Commission have not clearly understood what has been said in the O' Donnell Committee report in this regard.

It has been stated in O' Donnell Committee report that "The Zamindar of Phuljhar was against its inclusion in Orissa and alleged that the people were against merger with Orissa". Again it has been said in that report "A Mahammadan Malgujar and cultivator gave evidence to the same effect".

Out of one million Oriya people of Madhya Pradesh they have taken the opinions of three persons only.

In another part of the O.Donnell Committee report it has been stated : "15 witnesses supported the Orissa claim, but with two exceptions. All these witnesses were Oriyas".

In the context of what I have said I fail to understand how the O'Donnel Committee concluded as follows:—

"It is quite clear that there is no public opinion in Phuljhar except the few individuals and the whole population is ignorant".

When it is so stated in the report of the O'Donnell Committee how the Commission have observed as follows :

"In case of Phuljhar and Bindra-Nuagarh areas of the Raipur district, the O'Donnell Committee found overwhelming public support or their retention in the present Madhya Pradesh".

The report is rather rediculous. If the term "rediculous" is considered as not being a courteous expression then I would not use that term.

With regard to the Oriya-speaking outlying areas in the south, you will find that there are Oriyas from 15 to 20 miles beyond the border. Those Oriyas living beyond the border have been compelled to read Telugu. All schools having Oriya languages have been abolished. In several ways also they are being compelled to make themselves known as Telugus. We the Oriyas are rather emotional in nature and we are easily imbubed with the ideas of others. Whosoever have landed in Orissa, were given a place to live in.

When some one visits Puri, he is embraced with all love by the Oriyas. The Oriyas also adopt the local languages of the places where they reside. The people of Ganjam and Koraput were speaking Telugu like Andhras. They were wearing Dhotis like Telugus. There are Janas, Panjas and Maitees in Midanapur. Mohantys transformed into Maitees, Pandas into Panjas and Jenas into Janas.

Mr. SPEAKER : Likewise Sama's have been transformed into Sasmalls.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : Yes, Samalls were transformed into Sasmalls. Inspite of that they are unable to wipe out the Oriyas, but in the south the Oriya language is being changed. Before 10 years their condition was better than what it is now. After the transfer of some areas to Orissa they have been suffering a great deal. Some people of north are in favour of bringing those areas into Orissa and I am of opinion that our Government too holds the same view. But our Government are not pressing their claim on these areas. The ex-Zamindary of Budharsing has 85 per cent of Oriyas. There are 20 villages in the said Zamindary where the Oriya population is 89 per cent. Those areas could have come to Orissa easily but neither those areas are claimed nor they are coming. Similarly there are some other areas which should come to Orissa. They claim to come into Orissa and Orissa claims to bring them into her fold. Their language and that of Orissa is one and feelings are the same. The ways of their lives are the same. Why the Government have separated them and thrown them into distress. The Government have chopped off their tongues and have spoiled their nationality. This Commission too did not care to consider their troubles. The Commission might have seen some of those places. There are about 181 villages where there are 52,000 total population and Telugus 11,561 and the Oriyas and Savaras who are practically Oriyas are 40,879 in number. These Savaras speak the Oriya tongue. Some people are of the opinion that only 5 villages belonging to "Sankara" should come to Orissa. But why have not those villages been included in our claims ? Who authorised the Government to remain silent about these people. When Orissa State was formed, it secured an area of 61,000 sq. miles. But now it is only 60 thousand sq miles. When the boundaries were demarcated they snatched away an area of one thousand square miles. Our area decreased. The population also decreased. Now we should get them. The case of Midanapur should be left out now, because we have not claimed over it.

It is also our aim to keep the unity of India. But not of other provinces. The Unity of India can be maintained if the people of India do not quarrel between themselves. Should Orissa be murdered and sacrificed for it ? Could the Unity of India be maintained with the death of Orissa ? Let them say that Orissa should commit suicide. But it is told that Orissa will remain as a separate unit. But how will Orissa remain ? The way to keep the Unity is to ascertain public opinion. I also recollect one incident in this connection. When the Congress in its early stages commenced its work of organisation in Singhbhum, Dr. Rajendra Prasad was present and a question arose, whether Singhbhum will remain under the Utkal Congress Committee or the Bihar Congress Committee. The opinion of those who were members had been obtained. Now, a similar way is open to us all. It would be better if the Government of India could decide in that way, in case of disputed areas. I remember very well what the Finance Minister said on one occasion. When he laid claims of Orissa before the authorities of the Government of India, some one asked him what would be the effect of taking the public opinion ? Whether Singhbhum will remain in Orissa or in Bihar—let it be decided on plebiscite. The representative of Bihar told that there is no necessity of taking public opinion.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) : But this is not correct. On the other hand Bihar's Chief Minister demanded to have a referendum there. But we pointed out that already a referendum had been made in Sareikela and let it be accepted and if required public opinion in Singhbhum should be ascertained. We have no objection to it.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : If they have said so, it is alright. What I wish to say is that where there is any dispute over any area or place let it be decided in accordance with public opinion. No area should be retained under force. How long can you retain any area under force ? Things are fast changing. Can, that which exists today, last for ever ?

Then there is another thing. No body had any idea as to the manner in which the thought current is working in India today for the formation of States on linguistic basis. That idea had its origin in Orissa, but now when that is going to be implemented, Orissa is more adversely affected. It is said that States are to be reorganised on linguistic basis.

At some place, it is implemented forcibly under the pretext of convenience, at other places, the absence of direct communication become the ground and at some other places, where non of the above factors could be brought forward, the question of administrative convenience is cited. In 1948 when Sareikela was detached from Orissa, the plea of administrative convenience was advanced. This phrase "administrative convenience" is used where no other plea is available. English is a fine language. It admits of various interpretations on the basis of which many a thing can be decided. That is why they applied the term "administrative convenience".

Sir, you have decided not to admit some of the words and expressions which I have used in my amendment. Even then, I would request all the Hon'ble Members to tender their resignations spontaneously and voluntarily. In this matter I do not wish to compel anybody. Bombay has shown the example. It will not be good if we do likewise. If those who hold the reigns of a ministration, tender their resignations, it will be effective. In Bombay more than 104 members by resigning their seats, have shown how the object is to achieved. Let us all endeavour in this direction and see if it produces the desired effect. Lastly, I would request the Hon'ble Members to remember the way that leads to our goal and not to leave this way.

We will achieve our end through this way and through no other means. We advanced arguments, used courteous language, wept in wilderness and made several appeals and petitions but it bore no fruit. 'Passive Resistance" is the only way to achieve the object. Therefore, we all should resign.

Mr. SPEAKER : The Hon'ble Members are perhaps, aware that the Business Advisory Committee have allocated some definite time for discussion of this matter. The duration of the discussion will be eight hours. I declared that it might be extended to 9 or 10 hours.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : But now the situation is changed The scope of discussion is now wider. It would take more time to deal with other aspects of the report.

Mr. SPEAKER : When the Business Advisory Committee allocated the time, it did not know what would be the motion. Today the Assembly suspended its business only for an hour for the purpose of allowing members to table notices of amendments but today the questions were finished within half an hour. It means, we have lost half an hour from this eight hours. However, I propose that two more hours would be given for its discussion.

If the Hon'ble Members have no objection, we shall have two sittings on Monday, one from 7.30 A. M. to 1 P. M. and the other from 3 P. M. to 5 P. M.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : It would be better if we sit from 10.30 A. M. for 7 hours.

Mr. SPEAKER : The leader of the House and the leader of the Opposition should decide what to do.

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : We have no objection if the House sits from 10.30 A. M. for 7 hours.

Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK : Mr. Speaker, Sir, to-day is a memorable day for the State of Orissa. The discussions of his State Legislature relating to the boundaries of Orissa would be sent to the Government of India and the House of the People and on it depends whether Orissa's geographical boundaries would undergo any change and whether areas which are culturally and linguistically Oriya areas would be

included in Orissa. We have to see if as a result of these two days discussions, the aspirations of our State and our people would be fulfilled or not. The State Reorganisation Commission have admitted that the agitation of the Oriya people for the fulfilment of their aspirations began as early as 1903 up till now, i.e. for the past 52 years, the Oriya people have been demanding unification of all the Oriya-speaking tracts. The late Shri Madhusudan Das, popularly known as Madhu Barrister, was in the Congress party. It was he who first moved for formation of provinces on linguistic basis. But the then Congress slightingly threw away Mr. Das's proposal. Consequently, MadhuBabu started the Oriya movement under the auspices of the Utkal Sammilani, demanding unification of all the Oriya speaking areas and also the formation of provinces on linguistic basis. Again when in 1920 the Congress recognised the principle of forming linguistic provinces and arranged for the election of delegates to the Congress from the various provinces on linguistic basis, the Oriya people under the leadership of Utkalmani Gopabandhu Das, joined the special session of the Congress held at Calcutta. To-day this House is having discussions on the report of the States Reorganisation Commission.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, regreatfully I would say that the report of the Commission has smashed the hopes and aspirations of the Oriya people. The sort of agitational approach and the mode of expressing our attitude and resentment necessary under the existing situation, are lacking in this State. I would like to draw your attention to the motion tabled on behalf of our Government. In the motion moved by the Government for our discussion in the House it is stated that "The Report of the States Reorganisation Commission be taken into consideration". It means this Assembly do discuss the report of the States Reorganisation Commission. This is an enigma a mirage and simply airy, etherial-like. There is no demand in this. There is no mention of the urge of the Oriya nation. There is also nothing about Oriya nation, Orissa Government and the claims of the Orissa Legislative Assembly. The only mention in this is to consider. We never expected that our Government will make such empty sound before us. The Government should have clearly expressed the demands of our nation; they should have resolved in such manner so that all could have come to an agreement. If the claims of Oriya nation could have been clearly mentioned in the motion, it could have been unanimously agreed to by us all and I hope thereby our claims would have been stronger. On the other hand a motion has been put forward for the discussion of the report of the State Reorganisation Commission. Even our Government has not offered us the opportunity to discuss the views of the Commission with regard to Orissa. To-day our Government has put forward a motion before this House to discuss the principles and activities of the Commission as to how they have resolved the 32 States of India into 16 States.

In the State of Bombay and in Vindya Pradesh, when the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission were discussed, although their respective Chief Ministers had not been killed in the fury of the mob, they did not return to their home without sustaining injury. But although our State has been encroached upon from all sides, we are having a peaceful discussion. Sir, while the no-confidence motion against the Government was under discussion in this House, the Chief Minister said that the danger will be poignant soon after the publication of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. We should not capitalise the situation for our party ends, He appealed to all to face this national calamity unitedly.

He not only appealed to us but directed the Public Relations Department to publish his speech regarding the problem of re-organisation of States and got it circulated also. One lakh and twenty-five thousands of copies were made of it and were circulated. As soon as the report of the Commission was published all students of the Orissa schools and colleges did not attend thier insititutions. Complete Hartal was observed every where. Businessmen suspended their business. The work of the Legislature was also suspended, But some members of the treasury bench were present in this House. It is an ugly affair. Even the Chief Minister gave a speech in the House during our absence. The national aspirations of Oriyas cannot be fulfilled by such means. We hoped that our national aspirations will be fulfilled. We hoped that our top leaders of the Congress will take action about this. We hoped that our Chief Minister and the substitute in lieu of him who went to Delhi will try to fulfil the urge of the nation. But we did not know that they have returned from Delhi with "Delhika Laddu". We never imagined that our Ministers will forge our national urge after eating "Delhika Laddu" at Delhi. They blamed the nation for all kinds of strike and procession staged in our State. Our Government speak as if they are in a very helpless state. We have sown the seed, the tree is coming out after which it will bear fruit. But we know what will be the fruit. Sir, you are aware that Congress Working Committee met and discussed the report of the States Reorganisation Commission. Fortunately., our Chief Minister went there as a member of the working committee. But we could not find in any newspaper what he demanded for Orissa. Not even a word appeared in any newspaper as to what he expressed there.

Shri BANAMALI MAHARANA : Even it was not published in the Samaj.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): The whole thing has been published.

Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK : He has not said anything as regards the reaction of the working committee towards the report of the States Reorganisaton Commission, nor it has been published in any newspaper. Nor any press note has been published that he has put forth the claims of Orissa very strongly. Our Chief Minister do not pay any attention to ordinary or minor things He does not associate himself with narrow provincialism but with the great nationalism of India as a whole. To him the boundary affairs of Orissa may be very trifling. Hon'ble the Speaker, Sir, you know that there was a Chief Ministers' Conference regarding this and our Chief Minister did not attend the said conference. The reason for his not attending is his love for the world. Hence he deputed one veteran conservative Brahmin of Puri, who happens to be the Finance and Education Minister and resolved him to act in his behalf. He asked him to go and discuss. After this, Shri Radhanath Rath went. Many things were discussed at the Chief Ministers' Conference. In the discussion that took place with Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy, Shri Shrikrishna Sinha and our Finance Minister in place of the Chief Minister we had a hope that our claims have been put forth very strongly. In all the papers it was published that claims of Orissa have been put forth in Delhi very strongly. In the Chief Ministers' Conference there was argument between Shri Shrikrishna Sinha and Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy. But to all the arguments put forth by our Finance Minister the Chief Minister of Bihar said that I do not agree with him and I won't concede an inch of land from Bihar.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): The Hon'ble Member speaks as if he was present there

Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK : You did not say anything. I am speaking only what was published in the newspaper.

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : Did Shri Shrikrishna turn a deaf ear to Radha ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): Radhanath went but could not do anything after which Pratap Keshari went, but Kishori proved herself a failure.

Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK : Hon'ble the Speaker, you are aware that a Committee was constituted with members from all parties and Hon'ble the Finance Minister was the Chairman of the said Committee. The Committee decided to consider and put forth an United Claim based on geographical and historical aspects with close affinity to the language. It is a matter of regret that our Government have submitted the first, second and third memorandum but they have not done this taking into consideration the opinion of these 11 members of the Committee. The Government could not have any confidence on the Committee set up by this House for drawing the future boundary line of this country. Nothing more than this can be the misfortune of this nation.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): I want to inform this much that the memorandum which was submitted was placed before the Committee and nothing was kept secret.

Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK : Hon'ble the Speaker, even no member of this Assembly and yourself could get a copy of the memorandum two or three days prior to the sitting of the Assembly and what to speak of the members of the Committee.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): The Government are not bound to give the memorandum to anybody.

Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK: If the Government are not bound to intimate us as to what they claim such a Government becomes unrully and the nation and the country will take necessary steps against such an unsually Government.

Hon'ble the Speaker, our Government after submitting three memorandum have now put forth a supplementary memorandum with our minimum demand. Who gave the power to the Government to have a minimum demand. In the said minimum demand the Government have not claimed the

Midnapur portions from Bengal and have also made no claims from the South. Only Sareikela and Bindhra Nuagada have been claimed as has been admitted by the Finance Minister. Further he has expressed that we stand by our memorandum although they have put forth the minimum demand. Our Government have not pressed our former demands. Hence I will say that this Government have done treachery to this nation by submitting this minimum demand. We have now no way to demand the portion from South and also from Bengal. It is a great misfortune for this nation.

Hon'ble the Speaker, the States Reorganisation Commission have considered about Orissa after deciding the claims of other States. The Commission's report consists of 267 pages out of which the matters relating to Orissa appear in the pages from 199 to 202.

In other words they have answered only in three pages on the three books submitted by our Government. But in those three pages nothing has been mentioned about Orissa. They have practically murdered the hopes and urges of Orissa. Where they have considered about Madhya Pradesh they have not said anything about Bastar. When they have considered about Bengal they have not said anything about Midnapur. When they have considered about Bihar they have left out Singhbuhum, Sareikela and Kharswan. When they have considered about Andhra they have forgotten about our boundaries in the South. So at last when they considered about Orissa, it became every easy for them to draw the boundary line. The Commission have admitted this. It may be easy on the part of the Commission as 53 years back there were agitations with regard to the boundary of Orissa. Much of correspondence was made over the matter. The Phillip Duff Committee and the Atlee Committee were appointed. The Phillip Duff Committee came to see whether the Oriyas in Madras have any aptitude to come under Orissa, but there is no mention in the Report by Atlee Committee regarding the boundary of Orissa. The Oriyas welcomed the Simon Commission when they came to Orissa although throughout India there were black flag demonstrations before the Commission. It is that Simon Commission which reported for the first time that separate State for Oriyas should be formed.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): The H n'ble Member says that there is no mention of the boundary of Orissa in the Report of the Atlee Committee but does the Hon'ble Member know that the Atlee Committee recommended in their report for the transfer of Gopiballavpur then under Midnapore to Orissa ?

Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK : As far as I know the Atlee Committee have made no recommendations regarding the future boundary of Orissa. It can not be said that the O'Donnell Committee on the Report of which the States Reorganisation Commission have depended, could arrive at an impartial conclusion. Therefore the States Reorganisation Commission should not have attached so much of importance on the Report of O'Donnell Committee. The district of Koraput and the Parlakhimedi area have not been transferred to Orissa due to the recommendation of the O'Donnell Committee. In their recommendations there was no suggestion to transfer these areas. The Committee did not recommend to transfer Koraput district to Orissa although 75 per cent of the inhabitants there are Oriyas. This Committee did not also recommend for the transfer of Parlakhimedi to Orissa. Mr. O'Donnell only agreed to this transfer whereas the other two members did not agree. If is only at the time of the Second Round Table Conference that Parlakhimedi was transferred to Orissa by a white paper. When the O'Donnell Co-Committee proceeded to consider about the southern boundary of Orissa, they took the census figures of two groups only namely of Jalantar beyond Chikiti and Jarada Taluks to be inhabited by Andhras in majority. Had they proceeded a little further they would have seen Oriya-speaking people in vast numbers.

On the consideration of the existing Oriya population in the areas of Manjusa, Tikkali, Udyanakhanda, Ichapur and Jalantar, those areas should be merged with Orissa. I will speak about the southern boundary of the State afterwards. Now I will draw your attention to the report of the O'Donnell Committee regarding Singhbhum. O'Donnell Committee started their work in the year 1932. But this States Reorganisation Commission has functioned in the year 1955. They have come after many changed circumstances after the Orissa Province was created in the year 1936 and after all the ex-State areas have merged with Orissa. Both the Oriyas and Hos of Singhbhum have expressed their willingness before the Commission to merge with Orissa when the Commission came. Not only that but also the members of the State Legislature and Parliament and Adibasi members have expressed their opinion jointly that Singhbhum should be merged with Orissa.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Shri V. Sitaramayya): How much time the Hon'ble Member will take ?

Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK: Forty minutes more.

Mr. CHAIRMAN : Then you may speak tomorrow.

The House then adjourned to meet again at 10.30 A. M. Monday, the 28th November 1955.

Monday, the 28th November, 1955

Shri DIBAKAR PATNAIK : After the O'Donnell Committee the Dhar Commission was set up. It preceded the present Commission. The Dhar Commission considered the question of the merger of Sareikela and Kharswan with Orissa and also they considered as to which State Mount Abu should go. Before merger Mayurbhanj was an independent State. At that time it was argued that Sareikela and Kharswan were not contiguous to the State of Orissa and, therefore, it could not be integrated with Orissa. When Mayurbhanj was merged with Orissa the claim on Sareikela and Kharswan was reopened. Shri Lingaraj Panigrahi, the then Advocate-General and the present Hon'ble Chief Justice of Orissa was sent to Delhi to prove Orissa's claim on those areas. But it is very much regrettable that our the then Chief Minister, Dr. Harekrushna Mahtab expressed an opinion to the effect that Sareikela and Kharswan should remain with Bihar provisionally and that was the reason why Shri Panigrahi had to return without any alterative. As soon as Sareikela and Kharswan were provisionally transferred to Bihar, the Government of Bihar made the two State so transferred into a separate subdivision of the Singhbhum district. Thereafter both the States were declared two separate constituencies for the purpose of electing representatives to the Bihar Legislature. Sareikela and Kharswan which were given to Bihar temporarily have now been given to her permanently by the present Commission. The Hon'ble Member from Banpur, during the course of his speech has said that the Chhotnagpur Agency was the creation of the British Government. It consisted of Keonjhar and some portions of Sareikela and Kharswan excluding, of course, five praganas of Mayurbhanj. In 1947 the Maharaja of Mayurbhanj demanded his five praganas back. But that has not yet been acceded to. At one time those five praganas formed a part of Orissa. Although we have not claimed those areas in our Memorandum the fact remains that they once belonged to Orissa which can only be acertained from the History of Mayurbhanj. At the instance of the Government of Bihar, Shri Jaypal Singh cried for the creation of a separate State of Jharkhand and now it is gratifying to note that the Adibasis under the Leadership of our Minister for Tribal and Rural Welfare, Shri Sonaram Soren, opposed this vile propaganda. This is no doubt an auspicious sign for us. The Hos and Adibasis under the leadership of Shri Sonaram Soren have expressed their strong desire to merge with Orissa, but if the States Reorganisation Commission or the Government of India ignore the same; then it would be a great injustice for Orissa. The recommendations of States Reorganisation Commission, however, are only recommendatory in character and are not final decisions. Great injustice has been done to Orissa from the point of view of principle, whether geographical, cultural, administrative or linguistic or all taken together and if this is proved to the satisfaction of the Government of India and the Parliament. I hope Orissa will get back her just claims. If it is not done, the aspirations of the Oriya people will remain unfulfilled forever. If the demand for the unification of all Oriya speaking lands for which we have given the very first expression in India, is not conceded to, it will create indeed an undesirable situation.

Then I shall speak about the southern boundary of Orissa. The Commission did not think it fit to alter the decisions, of the O'Donnell Committee in regard to the southern boundaries of the State. The Commission only took into account one or two thickly populated Telugu villages. They did not care to go a little further and see the predominantly Oriya-speaking areas lying beyond the southern border, who ought to be merged with Orissa. You will see Sir, the boundary line between Andhra and Orissa has been drawn up in such a way that it creates serious disturbances in the smooth administration of the border areas by both the State Governments.

At every furlong in every mile you would see inscribed on each mile-stone "Orissa ends, Andhra begins" and "Andhra ends, Orissa begins", even it has been writtten at two or three different places within a mile. The result is that vehicles of the Government of Orissa have to pay double license fees. Moreover at the time of control, due to this unnatural demarcation of boundary, commodities such as paddy, rice and rabi crops produced in Orissa were regularly smuggled into Andhra.

This has also led to the smuggling of liquor from Orissa to Andhra where prohibition has been enforced. From the administrative point of view the demarcation of the boundary line between these two States has been unnatural. I would now like to refer to the Census Reports of the years 1931, 1941 and 1951. Those reports indicate that the total population of 60 villages of the Jalantar Estate is 17,002,85 per cent of which are Oriyas. According to the Census Report of 1951 the total population of 21 villages of the Budarsingh Estates is 3,744.95 per cent of which are Oriyas. 69 villages of the Manjusa Estate have a total population of 16,923 and the percentage of Oriyas among them is 78. Three villages of Ichhapur are inhabited by 856 persons and out of them 80 per cent are Oriyas. According to the Census Report of 1931 and 1951 the population of the village Saurar in Manjusa Estate is 2,791 and 3,526 respectively. All of them understand Oriya and the children there read in the Oriya schools. Similarly the population of 8 villages of the Tarala Estate is 5,128 of which 83 per cent are Oriyas. As regards Udyanakhanda, I should say that it consists of 24 villages of the Chikiti Estate. In Udyanakhanda the Oriyas live in large numbers. In my opinion the entire area consisting of Udyanakhanda, Jalantar, Ichhapur, Budarsingh, Tarala and Manjusa should all be merged with Orissa. I support the legitimate claim put forth by the Government of Orissa to the areas extending upto the Mahendra Hills and the rivers Mahendra-Tanaya and Bansadhara. Referring to the States Reorganisation Commission Report the Central Home Minister has recently declared that the interests of the minority linguistic groups in different States should be safeguarded. He means to console us and has further assured that the interests of the Oriyas who would remain in Andhra, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal as a result of the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission would be protected. The Commission have recommended the formation of 16 States in India each one of which would be an 'A' class States. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Maharaja of Kalahandi and some other Oriyas had been to Sareikela and Kharswan to create an atmosphere in favour of Orissa. They were beaten severely. The Central Government did not come to the rescue at that time. All the Members of this House then adopted a resolution on the matter which was sent to the Central Government. The matter did not end there. Two prominent Members of this House, namely Shri Radhanath Rath and Dr. Parija approached the Central Government with our resolution and asked for remedy. But it is a matter of great regret that the then Central Home Minister, Shri Kailashnath Katju, remarked that Bihar is a Part 'A' State and constitutionally speaking the Government of India cannot interfere in the internal affairs of a Part 'A' State. There is no provision in the Constitution empowering the Central Government to interfere in such affairs. What I want to explain is that there is no provision in the Constitution which empowers the Central Government to safeguard the educational, social and cultural interests of the Oriyas who would remain in Bihar, West Bengal, Andhra and Madhya Pradesh. Therefore it cannot be hoped that either our State Government or the Central Government would be able to protect the interests of the Oriyas who would live as a minority group in States other than Orissa. We would never get back amongst us the Oriyas who would now remain in the Andhra State. Their identity will be lost forever. When the sons and daughters of Oriyas will mutter through their dreams the languages of the Andhras, what more miseries could be wrought on the parents than to weep in the wilderness. That will be the result if the Oriya children are left out in those areas. They will forget their mother-tongue and culture too. So, if the Union Government or the House of the People do not decide to bring in the outlying Oriya tracts into Orissa, our fire of anguish and discontentment will remain unextinguished forever. Orissa is a part of India and hopes one day to grow into a powerful unit. Orissa will take her rightful place to contribute to the unity and solidarity of India only if the Government of India helps to collect togehter her scattered limbs and infuse new life into her. In return for this the Oriyas while forming a powerful unit under the Indian Union, will manage their own affairs efficiently and at the same time, I hope, will stand by the Union Government firmly and in a friendly manner. I shall take my seat after dealing with one more matter, i. e., the question of Bastar. We have claimed Bastar for merger with Orissa. The Commission have observed that they are not prepared to entertain Orissa's claim to Bastar on the ground that the Hubli and Paraja languages spoken there, are more akin to the Maharastra in language according to Grierson and Staunton. And they have decided to keep those areas under Madhya Pradesh Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Baster State is adjacent to Kotpad area of the ex-Jeypore Zamindari, the gap being only 22 miles which is bounded by high mountains in its western limits adjoining the Kanker ex-State area. We have no claim on the Kanker area.

But Bastar State is contiguous to the border of Koraput and Kalahandi districts of Orissa. Geographically and culturally it is purely an extension of Orissa State. You will be surprised to know that there the people observe the Car festival of Lord Shri Jagannath every year. In Puri they take out the deities of Jagannath, Balabhadra and Subhadra in three cars, but in Baster two Jagannaths, two Balabhdras and two Subhadras are taken out in six cars. The Maithili Brahmin Community and the Jharkhand Brahmin Community have separate cars for their deities. Adibasis and non-Adibasis alike participate in this car festival held by the Jharkhand Brahmin Community there, but the Utkali Brahmins who have gone there from Orissa hold a separate car festival. Oriya language is commonly used in the weekly village markets Only in courts and offices the Hindi language is used by the people. The Hubli and Parja languages are spoken by the people in their homes. But they talk with the Oriya people in the Oriya language. So without taking into account the historical, cultural and geographical affinity with Orissa, how could the Commission say that it should not be merged with Orissa. Unless and until our just claim on Bastar area is conceded we cannot rest in peace and it would be a great injustice. With regard to Midanapur, the Commission have observed that they have indentified themselves with the Bangalies so far as their culture is concerned, but even to-day Sir, you will see, that the people of South Midnapur are reading the holy Bhagabat of Jaganrath Das in Bengali script and culturally they have remained Oriyas even to this day. The people there observe Sudhi ceremony after 12 days of the death of their relations, but in Bengali it is observed after one month. So from the cultural point of view they have not become fully Bengalised, they still remain Oriyas in full sense of term. I should say that the Commission have not throughly investigated into these aspects.

Therefore, in my opinion, South-West Midnapur adjoining North Balasore, Bastar, Bindra-Nuagarh, Phuljhar, Seraikela, Kharswan, parts of Singhbhum and Dhalbhum subdivisions, which we have justly claimed, should be merged with Orissa. In the South, our claim over the territory upto the river Bansadhara is justifiable. These have been dealt with in our Memorandum. These are our demands and our sole aim is to bring them into Orissa. Unless and until our claims in regard to the areas made by our Government in their memorandum are fulfilled, we will carry on the struggle and will not allow the Government of India to rest in peace. I, therefore hope, the Government of India, will concede to the firm and just claims of the Oriya people. I, therefore, appeal to the Hon'ble Members belonging to different parties, to unanimously accept my amendment.

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : Mr. Speaker, Sir I thank you for having given me the opportunity to take part in the discussions relating to the report of the States Reorganisation Commission. If you look at the present map of India you will find that the different States have been formed as a result of historical accident.

The Britishers first brought the coastal areas under their rule and their territorial possessions extended only along the coast line, which were constituted into provinces from the administrative point of view, economic convenience and also from the point of view of military strategy. When they reorganised the whole of India and formed district provinces the ulterior motive was to supress regional revolts and revolutionary movement for national independence. It is borne out by the fact when Lord Curzon passed a resolution for division of Bengal in the year 1905 and tried to implement it. They formed small administrative units with a view to keep the people under their control so as to rule smoothly over them and also to make the British rule permanent. But the proposed partition of Bengal could not be implemented and they were compelled to give up their decision in regard to the partition of Bengal in the year 1911.

But now the conditions have changed and our country has become independent Sovereignty now rests with the people and they should be taken into confidence for the administration of the country. Now we have to see that we do not act on the directions from London or from the British Parliament for the administration of our country. The Administration should reach the general public at large. It should be carried on in such a manner so as to ensure relations with the public and to bring everything within the knowledge of the people. We have passed the official language bill with a view to ensure

the use of Oriya as an official language and to enable the people to understand all that the Government are doing for their welfare or the activities of the Government. The Commission have observed that in case of a multilingual or a bilingual States the administration cannot be carried on efficiently. Therefore they have emphasized on the need to have unilingual States. Otherwise the linguistic minorities in each State will labour under a sense of frustration and distrust and they will remain neglected. And further, they will have misgivings and distrust towards the linguistic group which is in majority. This is not good for the country.

You will see that some Oriya-speaking areas have been left out in Bihar and some in Andhra and yet others in Madhya Pradesh. You will please consider and see if an Oriya of an Oriya-speaking tract lying in Andhra can ever have the hope to become one day the Chief Minister of that State or to get an opportunity to shoulder the responsibility of administration. That is the reason why they harbour a sense of frustration and distrust. That is why the Commission have recommended for the formation of unilingual States. They have also stated that most of the States in India are unilingual such as Uttar Pradesh, Rajsthan, West Bengal, etc. A multilingual State creates serious administrative difficulties. It was so in the case of the State of Madras and to get over this difficulty a separate Andhra State was formed; and the administration of this Andhra State is running very smoothly. It is crticised in some quarters that by dividing the country into fragments the unity of India will be impaired and the country will become weak; but such an argument is deviod of logic. For the last forty years the Indian National Congress have been saying over and over again that States should be reorganised on linguistic basis and they also formally constituted different Congress Committees on linguistic basis. For example there were two types of Congress Committees in Bihar—One was the Bihar Provincial Congress Commitee having jurisdiction over all the District Congress Committees and the other was the Singhbhum District Congress Committee which was under the Orissa Provincial Congress Committee. Similarly in Madras there were two Provincial Congress Committees, namely, the Tamilnad Provincial Congress Committee and the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee. In Bombay also there were two such Committees, namely, the Gujarat Provincial Congress Committee and the Maharastra Provincial Congress Committee and in Central Province there were the Vidarbha Congress Committee and the Mahakosal Congress Committee. But it is not understood why they think that the formation of States on lingustic basis will be a blunder. We find in the History of Russia that States in that country have been formed on linguistic basis. In Russia ther are several lingustic groups speaking different languages. So they have different States—such as Tazkistan, Turkimanisthan, etc., formed on linguistic basis. But all the same Russia has not grown weak nor its unity has been impaired. In India for the purpose of reorganising the States on linguistic basis a High Power Commission has been set up and they have expressed their opinion in favour of linguistic States. In 1928, after the all parties Conference, the Nehru Committee was set up. That Committee laid much stress on public opinion. Besides, the Congress Working Committee, which met in Calcutta in 1937 and at Wardha in 1938, emphasised the need for the formation of States on linguistic basis. In 1945-46, the Congress Election Manifesto was issued on that basis. Then, when the Constituent Assembly was constituted to frame the Indian Constitution, it appointed the Dhar Committee to investigate into and report on the feasibility of reorganising the provinces on linguistic basis,taking into consideration geographical contiguity, financial capacity and such other incidental matters as the Committee may deem necessary in respect of each Province.

But as several complicated problems cropped up in the wake up the partition of the country, the Committee recommended to keep the matter in abeyance for sometime. Then in 1948, the Jaipur Congress appointed the J.V.P. Committee to go into the question. According to their recommendations, the Andhra State was first formed on linguistic basis. Due emphasis was laid on the principle of linguistic States in the Congress Election Manifesto of 1951. Besides, the Hyderabad and the Kalyani Sessions of the Congress while accepting the same principle laid much stress on the question of taking into account the wishes of the people and security of the country. From this you will see that popular opinion has always been acknowledged as the criterion for the solution of all problems. Now we have to consider how far the Commission have paid regard to public opinion in making their recommendations. Further I would like to say that when we are going to build a socialistic pattern of society, we should see that no individual gets an opportunity to exploit another and that should be our aim. It should also be our aim to see that one region does not exploit anohther region and that one region is not exploited by another region.

The people of Asia and Africa are being exploited by more powerful and advanced countries, and so they have held a Conference at Bungadung to safeguard their own interests. Now we have to think very deeply how to unify all the outlying Oriya tracts and how to make the Orissa State rich and prosperous. When the States Reorganisation Commission visited Cuttack, they received several memoranda from individuals and institutions. And among them the Memorandum submitted on behalf of our Government is worthy of mention. It is a very fine Memorandum. But it contains some errors which the Government have not so far attempted to rectify.

It was brought to the notice of Government that with regard to the population of Mahasmund Tahsil rural, parts A and B. The Registrar-General of Census Operations had been addressed in the matter and they should have made necessary corrections according to his report. But we have not come across any such correction slip. With regard to Bindra Nuagarh. the Government have not presented a clear case. This is indeed regrettable. At page 128 of the Memorandum the total population of Mahasmund Tahasil rural B has been shown as 269,.919 of which the Oriya population is 50, 925. On calculation, the percentage of Oriya population comes to 18.8 per cent whereas in the Memorandum it has been shown 11 per cent only. Any body who sees it, will summarily reject our claim. I fail to understand how such an error could come in.

Again nothing was mentioned with regard to Baster in the original Memorandum. But when the Utkal Sammilani and Ganatantra Parishad pressed for Orissa's claim over Baster, the Government again submitted a fresh Memorandum on Baster. The Maps given in the Government Memorandum were first placed before the Indian Statutory Commission in 1931. There is no meaning in giving these Maps in this Memorandum. It has made Orissa's case weak by more than 50 per cent.

Even then this map has been submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission. It has been said that the Oriya population in Rayagada is only 10 to 20 per cent. It is not understood why the Government were anxious to print the Maps, the statements and the documents, etc., which went against our interest. The Memorandum submitted by the Utkal Pradesh Congress Committee is of no better standard than some unknown booklets on Gopibhasa and Natuchori. It is difficult to understand what claims have been made therein. At one place in the said Memorandum it has been written that this Committee under the circumstances feel that no useful purpose will be served by burdening the Commission with a separate Memorandum.

Shri BIJOY KUMAR PANI : Will the Hon'ble Member read the letter portion of the Memorandum ?

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : I speak of the Sub-Committee.

Shri BIJOY KUMAR PANI : Has he not read whether the Provincial Congress Committee emphatically said that we do stand by the Memoranda submitted by the Orissa Government ?

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : I am subject to correction. The Hon'ble Member may point that out when he speaks. He can have it whenever he wants.

When the States Reorganisation Commission Report has already been published we are to see what logic was put forth by Orissa and in what light the Commission have considered the claims of Orissa. Examine it minutely and in detail you will find that this is a bundle of contradictions, and inconsistencies. Although we put forth our claim on the whole of Singhbhum District, the Commission at page 200 of the Report have said about "the Singhbhum district of Bihar particularly Sareikela and Kharaswan". This was not the claim of any particular party.

We claimed the whole of the Sadar subdivision of the Singhbhum District and particularly Seraikela. The Commission have based their recommendations on the decisions made by the O' Donnel Committee in the year 1931 during the Imperialist rule under the British Government. They have said that there is no reason to differ from the views held by the O' Donnel Committee in this connection. On the other hand they have recommended to alter the different decisions of the tribunals constituted some 3 to 4 years ago. After 1932 Orissa has gone through a series of changes. The ex-States with an area of about 29,000 square miles have merg-

ed with Orissa. The Map of Orissa has undergone a revolutionary change. Without considering all this, the Commission have said that they find no reason to alter the decisions of the O. Donnell Committee of 1932. The Misra Commission of 1953 recommended for the merger of the district of Bellari with Mysore. The present Commission have recommended to alter the said decision. In 1948, the Government of India ordered the merger of a portion of Seroi State, in which Mount Abu is situate, with Bombay basing of course their decisions on the recommendations of the White Paper on Indian States. But the present Commission reconsidered the whole question and have recommended for its merger with Rajasthan. Similarly on geographical considerations, the Estate of Lahore merged with the district of Hissar in East Punjab. Now the Commission have served Lahore from East Punjab and have recommended for its merger with Bikaneer District of Rajasthan. From these accounts it is clear that in some cases the Commission could decide to alter the decisions made three to four years ago but while considering the case of Orissa they have purposefully refrained from altering the decisions arrived at by the O'Donnel Committee in the year 1932 some 23 years ago. It is matter of great regret that due consideration has not been given to Orissa. At page 170, para. 624 of the Commission's Report it has been stated "The controvercies over Seraikela and Kharaswan are comparatively more recent". The history of Singhbhum certainly reveals that this district was formed with the amalgamation of small pieces of ex-State areas.

In the beginning Dhalbhum was a part of Midnapur District but in course of time it merged with Singhbhum. In 1833 the British Government created a province called the South-West Frontier Province. The purpose was to suppress the rising of the Kondhs in Ranchi. The Agent of the Governor-General was placed in charge of that Province. In 1837. Kolhono was amalgamated and the Agent of the Governor-General shifted the District Headquarters to Chaibasa. In 1854 the Agent of the Governor-General was desgnated as the Commissioner of Chotanagpur. In 1858, the Ruler of Porahat revolted against the British Regime as a result of which he was dethroned and his territory was amalgamated with Singhbhum. About a century after, in 1948 with the merger of Sareikela and Kharaswan with Singhbhum, its size increased and its contours underwent a further change. In the year 1954 the States Reorganisation Commission have remarked that Orissa's claim to these areas rests mainly on the ground that Oriya is the largest single language group But in none of the Memoranda it was claimed that the Oriyas from the largest single language group. We have all along been saying that the different linguistic groups in Singhbhum have close affinity with the Oriyas. If we take into account all the Oriya-speaking people they would certainly from the single largest group. But the Commission have tried to prove that Oriya is not the largest single language group. In the Memoranda submitted by the Government, Utkal Sammilani and the Ganatantra Parishad, it has been clearly proved how the Hos, who are in majority in singhbhum Sadar and in Seraikela and Kharaswan, have social and economical bonds with the Oriyas. According to the Census Report of 1931 the Ho population is as follows:—

Sinbhghum (including Seraikela and Kharaswan)	349.664
Sadar subdivision(including Sareikla and Kharaswan)	330,197
Chotanagpur (excluding Singhbhum)	104
Orissa (excluding Singhbhum)	182,935
Mayurbhanj ..	1,108,996

The Census Report of 1951 also reveals the distribution of Ho population in a similar way and their number in the whole Bihar State is as follows:—

Whole of Bihar (excluding Chotanagpur) ..	0
Chotnagpur Division ..	4,520
Singhbhum District	413,703

More or less the Hos are found in each and every district of Orissa. The Hos are found in the districts of Cuttack, Balasore, Puri, Sambalpur, Ganjam, Koraput, Dhenkanal, Keonjhar, Balangir, Sundargarh and Mayurbhanj, etc. Their number is overwhelmingly great in the distrct of Mayurbhanj.

From this it will be clear that Orissa is the homeland of the Hos. When this was represented before States Reorganisation Commission they remarked that if Singhbhum Sadar, Sareikela and Kharaswan are brought into Orissa, it will solve the problem of the Hos and the Oriyas and further they said that this areas will become the Jharkhand of the Hos. It is highly regrettable that the Commission without taking into consideration of factors, have recommended for maintaining the status quo in respect of the Bihar-Orissa boundary. They have observed :

"The two states, however, have formed part of the Singhbhum District since May, 1948, and the historical affinities of the two states with the Porahat Raj in Singhbhum District, on the one hand, and with the administration which was in charge of the Chotanagpur division, on the other, are held to justify the decision to include them in Bihar".

Sir, it appears that the Commission while considering the question of the historical affinities of the two States forgot that both Sareikela and Kharaswan are purely two Oriya states. Both the states were under the Orissa States Agency throughout. These two states of course were under the Chotanagpur administration before the Orissa States Agency was formed. But the Commission have mentioned in para. 231 of the Report:

"While, therefore, we have been alive to the value of historical connections and links, we have not been disposed to attach undue importance to arguments based on them."

Although the Commission have stated that they would not attach much importance to historical facts, they have none the less based their arguments on historical grounds and have rejected our claims. This is quite incorrect.

In para. 625 , at page 171 of the Report they have stated—

"In this case, moreover, the Oriya percentage in rural portion is only about 26; and those speaking this language do not seem to be concentrated, any where within the subdivision to such an extent that linguistic affinities can be regarded as clear and unmistakable."

They have stated that language is not the only principle but administrative convenience and other factors should also be taken into consideration. Although the 1951 Census figures are in our favour, they do not fully believe it on the ground that both Bihar and Bengal have challenged the data.

In para. 644 they have stated—

"The linguistic complexion of the disputed areas is unfortunately not quite clear. The mother-tonge data of the 1951 Census have been challenged by both Bengal and Bihar and only a broad judgment as to the relative numerical strength of various linguistic groups in the districts of Purnea, Santhal Parganas, Manbhum and Goalpara, seems possible. Neither West Bengal nor Bihar has, in these circumstances, confined itself to arguing from past figures.Both the Governments have relied on a number of subsidiary factors in order to prove the cultural affinity of the disputed areas."

They have not taken into account these subsidiary factors while disposing of the case of Singhbhum, Seraikela and Kharaswan. But in para. 625 they appear to have stated the real reason for not transferring Singhbhum, Seraikela and Kharaswan to Orissa. They have said in para. 625.

"In view of the recommendations which we make in the next Chapter for the transfer of part of the Manbhum district to West Bengal, the transfer of the Seraikela subdivision, or any portion thereof, to the State of Orissa will convert the Dhalbhum subdivision in the east into an enclave which will not be physically contiguous to the rest of Bihar".

This is the only argument. Although they have admitted that Singhbhum Sadar, Seraikela and Kharswan ought to be included in Orissa they have not recommended their transfer to Orissa in view of their ealier decision to transfer Purlia subdivision of Manbhum to West Bengal for which they apprehended that if further portions of Bihar be transferred to Orissa, it would break the geographical contiguity of Dhalbhum subdivision with the rest of Bihar, making it an isolated island.

It is difficult on my part to understand how the geographical contiguity will be broken if not the whole of it but a portion of Seraikela and Kharaswan is transferred to Orissa If they want to have contiguity, they can claim a corridor. The Commission could have recommended for it. But when West Bengal demanded a corridor to connect Murshibadad with the northern part of the State, Bihar argued that we are all living in India, though scattered, under one Union. Then where is the necessity for a corridor or geographical contiguity. But when the question of Dhalbhum comes in, itis argued that no portion of Sareikala or Kharaswan should be given to Orissa as that will convert the Dhalbhum subdivision into an enclave.

Then, Sir, in paragraph 232 of the Report you will see that the Commission have accepted the aspect of physical grography as a second factor. Then why have the Commission given so much stress over physical geography when the question of Singhbhum Sadar with Sareikela and Kharaswan is raised. If they are of opinion that it will be inconvenient on the part of Bihar to administer the area if the geographical contiguity is lost, then we are prepared to give them th northern portion of Singhbhum, Sareikela and Kharaswan to

serve as a corridor or in the alternative they may take some portions of Manbhum. From the point of view of administrative convenience, they have observed that Orissa's claim in regard to Singhbhum was rejected in 1932. They have stated—

"It may be recalled that in 1932 the O, Donnell Committee considered the question of the transfer of this entire district as it then was, to the proposed Oriya-speaking State, but declined to recommend its inclusion in Orissa, on the ground, amongst others, that its geographical position and lines of communication favoured its retention in Chotanagpur"

But, Sir, after the transfer of Manbhum to West Bengal and the merger of Keonjhar, Mayurbhanj, Bonai and Sundargarh with Orissa you will see from the Map of India that Singhbhum, Seraikela and Kharaswan have better facilities of road and rail communications with Orissa than with Bihar. There is no railway communication to those areas. Only one road links it up. From the Orissa side there is possibility of railway communication from Barbil and Badampahar and also from Sundargarh on the Calcutta-Bombay line. Besides these, there are three roads leading to Chaibasa from Raifrangpur and from Champua. So from the point of view ot communication facilities, Orissa, claim is the strongest. We are not claiming a new State which may involve territorial adjustments on considerations of military strategy. Had it been the case of North Forntier Agency of Kashmir, such as argument would have some meaning. But the present question is adjustment of boundaries. That will be decided by public opinion to which we are always giving the first preference. More emphasis was laid on this factor of public opinion in the Congress Election Manifesto issued in 1951. Public opinion in Seraikela and Kharaswan in contrary to their retention in Bihar.

You know that the Ganatantra Parishad contested the general elections in Sareikela on the issue of merger of Seraikala and Kharaswan with Orissa and the Ganatantra Parishad candidate Shri Mihir Kabi secured a very large number of votes in every booth and was elected. This clearly reflects the public opinion. Most of the M. L. As. of Singhbhum have also submitted memoranda expressing their desire to merge with Orissa. I had an interview with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We are grateful to him for having given us an opportunity for interview. But I was surprised to learn one thing from him He said that it had never been brought to his notice before that the Adibasis of Singhbhum are anxious to merge with Orissa. I told him that the Adibasi M. L. A's of Singhbhum have given him a memorandum in which they have expressed their desire to merge with Orissa. He again asked me who they are ? I explained to nim that they have been elected on Jharkhand ticket. Jharkhand does not mean that they want to remain in Bihar. The original demand of the Adibasis was to have a separate Jharkhand State comprising some areas of Bihar and also of Orissa.

The Adibasis of Singhbhum submitted a memorandum before the States Reorganisation Commission for the creation of a separate state of Jharkhand but when they came to know that the creation of a separate State of Jharkhand was impossible and the Commission, as a matter of fact, have not recommended for the same, they have now submitted a fresh memorandum to merge with Orissa. For that reason inceasing efforts are going on in Bihar to persuade the Hos, Mundas and other Adibasis to come over to Delhi and influence the Delhi circle otherwise. But these Adibasis do not want to say something other than what they have submitted in their latter memorandum. If the M.L.A's of that area have expressed in strong terms their opinion to merge with Orissa, the question of these Adibasis who are being called to Delhi does not arise. The States Reorganisation Commission have clearly mentioned in paragraph 667 of their Report:—

"From a linguistic point of view Singhbhum District is the meeting ground of the Ho, Oriya, Bengalee, Hindi and Santali. The languages are important roughly in the order named."

It means, the Commission have admitted that the Ho population is the largest. Next comes Oriya, then Bengali, then Hindi and then Santali. I have made it clear long before that the Ho and the Oriya problem will be solved for ever if Sareikela and Kharaswan along with Singhbhum merge with Orissa. Moreover with regard to Singhbhum, the O'Donnell Committee have stated "The Oriya preponderance is not marked in the subdivision as a whole but in each one of the local units with the exception of the extreme north-west corner of the district and the municaipl area of Chakradharpur and Chaibasa. That is to say that the O, Donnell Committee have indirectly admitted that there is Oriya majority in every village units. The injustice done by the O' Donnell Committee by not acceding to the merger of Singhbhum with Orissa had its reactions which found expression in the note submitted by a Government Officer to the Bihar and Orissa Government I am reading those portions—

"There is almost unanimous sentiment amongst the thinking Oriyas in favour of a separate Orissa and although this is natural inclination to expand the boundaries of the proposed province beyond the units.

× × × × × ×

Mr. C. L. Phillips who was the Commissioner of Orissa Division has written in paragraph 10 of his report about the reaction mainfested on the creation of Orissa without Singhbhum as its integral part. "There is a strong feeling of despondency in the exclusion of Singhbhum. It is left that undue importance has been given to census figures which have been challenged and the Oriya figures such as there have been unfairly printed against Hindi and Bengali figures and a large number of doubtful.

× × × × ×

From what I have said it is very clear that the injustice done by the imperialistic British Government was also condemned by their own officers. We had the greatest hope in the States Reorganisation Commission and we thought that they would perhaps be able to deliver us from the injustice done.

(Interval for lunch)

Shri GHASIRAM SANDIL : On a point of order, Sir, I gave notice of an amendment on the original resolution. But I do not know what has happened to it. Here I may read out the resolution proposed by me for the shake of clarification.

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : It is in the midst of my speech Sir, and it is not a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER : A point of order can be raised on what the Hon'ble Member Shri Pratap Keshari Deo says.

Shri GHASIRAM SANDIL : In that case I am leaving the House for sometime as a protest.

Mr. SPEAKER : I find that many Hon'ble Members desire to take part in the Debate. So the normal working hours of the House has been extended by two hours more. The Hon'ble Member Shri Pratap Keshari Deo wants to speak for another two hours. I would therefore request him to finish his speech within one hour at best.

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : Of course, I would try. Sir, the case of the Abu Road Taluk is similar to that of Sareikala and Kharaswan. The Commission have said something at page 137, paragraph 505 of their Report to which I would like to draw your attention as well as the attention of this House.

"It may be argued that no clear case has been made out either on administrative or economic grounds for the separation of the Abu Road Taluk from the district of which it forms a part. There are, however, two important facts bearing on this question, which cannot be overlooked. Firstly this area was only recently separated from an administrative unit with which it had a long association and which now forms part of Rajasthan. Secondly, a part from the fact that a majority of the people of this area have not so far reconciled themselves to this separation, the Government of Ind a had decided in 1952 to reopen this question and they had also set in motion the process contemplated in Article-3 for readjustment of State territories. After taking all this into consideration we have reluctantly been compelled to recommend a review of the decision taken in 1950".

Speaker Sir, the grounds for readjustment of the Abu Road Taluk are exactly similar to that of Seraikela and Kharaswan. Sareikela and Kharaswan had a very long association with an administrative unit called the Eastern States Agency.

The Eastern States Agency have integrated with the old districts of Orissa. Very recently Sareikela and Kharaswan were ta'en out and they were merged with Bihar. The majority of the people of those two ex-States could hardly reconcile themselves with this artificial separation. They have all along been expressing a desire to merge with Orissa through the press and the platform. The Commission have said that the Government of India under Article-3 of the Constitution had decided to reopen the question regading the Abu Road Taluk for readjustment of State boundaries. In this connection, I would like to say that in course of reply to the question

No. 687, dated the 13th May 1953, the then Central Home Minister, Shri Kailashnath Katju, had suggested to bring in a proposal under Article-3 of the Constitution. From this it would be clear that this is a question similar to the question of Mount Abu. Which they have been reviewing since 1 48. The Commission with regard to the case of Mount Abu have attempted to justify the decisions of the Tribunal. The terms of reference to the Tribunal set up by the Central Government under the Chairmanship of Hon'ble Justice Shri Bhopatkar of the Bombay High Court were to take account of the following factors:—

(1) the wishes of the people of the State.
(2) their historical, economic, linguistic and cultural affinities,
(3) considerations of Administrative Convenience.

In the terms of reference the first matter for consideration was the wishes of the people "the second was historical, economic, linguistic and cultural affinities" and the third was "administrative convenicice".

The last general election has clearly proved that the inhabitants of Sareikela and Kharaswan are in favour of merger with Orissa. There is no boubt about the fact that Sareikala and Kharaswan have historical link with Orissa from remote past. Every body knows that, on the economic side, the people there depend on the import of paddy, rice, fuel, bamboo and other commodities from Mayurbhanj. The States Reorganisation Commission have given a decision against us mainly on linguistic grounds. They have said that in those areas Oriyas are not in absolute majority. And the Hos to our number as the Hos are not to be found anywhere else except in the Sadr subdivision of Singhbhum and Sareikala and Kharswan and the Oriyas will definitely form the absolute majority. Since the Commission have put the percentage of the Oriya population only as it would appear against persons speaking otner languages, their decisions did not go in favour of the Oriya-speaking population. But strictly speaking judging with the same data and in the same manner the decision cannot also go in favour ot the Hindi-speaking population. If the Oriyas are 25 per cent, The Hindi-speaking population is only 12 1/2 per cent. It is very difficult to understand how Sareikala and Kharswan could be recommended for merger with Bihar if not with Orissa. Again from the stand point of cultural affinities you may kindly see that the Chhau Dance of Sareikela and each festival of Singhbhum beginning from the dress to food preparation etc., have close connection with that of the people of Orissa. It is needless to repeat those things here again. Let us now come to the question of administrative convenience. After Manbhum is taken away from Bihar, there will remain to link between Bihar and the areas we have claimed for: not even by railway. It is easier to have administrative control over Singhbhum from Orissa than from Bihar, Justice Bhopatkar could do nothing in accordance wth the terms of reference and so the State Ministry ordered that as Mayurbhanj had not merged with Orissa and as there was no geographical contiguity with Orissa. Sareikela and Kharswan should be merged with Singhbhum. It has been proved beyond doubt that since the merger of Mayurbhanj the people of Sereikala and Kharswan have expressed their desire to come over to Orissa. Therefore it may kindly be seen that judging the matter in all its aspects Sareikela and Kharswan should be integrated with Orissa.

Such minor boundaries adjustments, like the question whether Singhbhum should remain with Orissa or with Bihar, finds no place in the terms of reference of the States Reorganisation Commission. The introductory paragraph 2 of this Report contains the terms ot reference which reads as follows:—

"The Government expect that Commission would, in the first instance, not go into the details, but make recommendations in regard to the broad principles which should govern the solution of this problem and, if they so choose, the broad lines on which particular States should be reorganised, and submit interim reports for the consideration of Government."

They were asked to lay down the broad principles, on the basis of which, all the States could be reorganised on linguistic basis. They were also asked to recommend for minor boundary adjustments with regard to the location of police-station. But in many cases they have gone beyond the terms of reference to make detailed recommendations. The Commission have proposed to make Jubbalpur, the Capital of Madhya Pradesh, over which great controversies have arisen. The Commission's report has also given rise to controversies in Vindhya Pradesh. You of course know all this. They were not empowered to create such controversial issues. While discussing the case in Singhbhum the Commission have been stated to have said that they would consider the case of readjustment of boundaries only districtwise and would not spilt up a district as far as possible. But in actual practice they have not only split up the district of Manbhum, they have gone to the extent of splitting up its police-stations. They have excluded Chasa police-station in their recommendations for integration of the Purulia sub-division with West Bengal, as otherwise the Bengalees could not have formed the majority had that police-station been included in Purulia. Had they adopted the same principle in the case of Singhbhum, the decision must have gone in favour of Orissa. But that they did not do for obvious reasons.

They have emphasised in paragraphs 221 to 228 of their Report that the wishes of the people is a strong force. In paragraph 228 they have said "The wishes of the people of small areas were entitled to fullest consideration". In the cases of small areas the wishes of the people were honoured. How the same principle could escape their notice while considering our case is rather an enigma to me. While speaking about Orissa's claim over the Oriya-speaking outlaying tracts in Bihar, the only thought that automatically comes to my mind and about which I have great apprehension is that perhaps the Commission have in their view Hindi Imperialism or the predominance of Hindi all over India. Perhaps with that view before them they have recommended formation of four big Hindi States such as Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Rajsthan whereas the States to be formed in the south are of small sizes. They have proposed to split up Andhra into Andhra and Telangana States although the entire region is unilingual. Although Maharashtra had a strong case, the Commission have recommended to take it away from Vidarbha so as to be controlled by Bombay. When all the States are being reorganised mainly on linguistic basis I fail to understand how Sareikela and Kharswan will be tagged into Bihar instead ot being merged with Orissa.

Sir, You know that in Bihar Maithili is the spoken language in the area to the north of the River Gangas. In the Patna division, which is in the heart of Bihar people speak Hindi. Towards the east Bengali is the spoken language. There are large number of Adibasis in the tribal area. These Adibasis have no particular spoken language. They speak different languages. Some of them speak Hindi and some Santali. If you proceed towards the south you will see Oriya-speaking areas only. I do not understand on what basis the States Reorganisation Commission have recommended Bihar to be unilingual inspite of all these differences. A day will come when Bihar will go through the same experience which Bombay and Punjab faced being a bilingual State. Instead of solving the existing problems they have created new ones. So long the State of Bihar would appear in the map of India in the form recommended by the Commission from the point of view of administrative convenience, the problem will remain for ever. Bihar must therefore disintegrate. Then only the areas of Bihar, having different spoken languages, will merge with their respective linguistic group States, as has elsewhere been recommended by the Commission and it is only then that those people will feel satisfied. As a result of countrywide demonstrations against the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission, the Central Government have decided to reconsider the whole question and the Congress High Command have set up a powerful Sub-committee in this regard. The activities of the Leaders of Bihar in Delhi in this respect are worthy of being observed. They have no cogent arguments in their favour. There is no public opinion behind them. They have resorted to emotional propaganda. Shrikrushna Sinha, the Chief Minister of Bihar is reported to have said "If an inch of land is transferred from Bihar, then Bihar shall stand on the top of the graveyard of the Congress". This is an emotional appeal. Efforts are being made to influence the M. Ps. No reasonable man belonging to any party can support such an emotional approach. There is also a rumour that our top-ranking leaders who are occupying the highest positions have a hand in this. I will of course be very happy if such a rumour ultimately proves unture.

Now I shall present to you our claims on Madhya Pradesh. It has been said in this connection in the Report that we see no reason, therefore, to reopen the decision of the O'Donnell Committee regarding this area in 1932. "The States Reorganisation Commission would not have offered such arguments had they gone through the Report of the O'Donnel Committee. It is recorded in the Report of the

O'Donnell Committee "Zamindar of Phuljhar was against inclusion in Orissa and alleged that people were against merger with Orissa. A Mahammadan Malguzar and cultivator gave evidence to the same effect. Fifteen witnesses supported the Oriya claim with two exceptions. All these witnesses were Oriyas." How could they get 'overwhelming public support' from this ? Have they got a separate dictionary for the meaning of the word "overwhelming" ?

Bindhra-Nuagarh has been lost to Orissa by default. The Leaders of Sambalpur made no mention of Bindhra Nuagarh in their memorandum, but claimed if for inclusion only a day before the arrival of the Committee. As no arguments were offered in favour of inclusion of Bindhra-Nuagarh, the claim was set aside. So far as Phuljhar is concerned it has been said "transfer of Phuljhar to Orissa will not effect adversely either economically or administratively. On the other hand communication with Bargarh is good indeed during rains."

They have recommended Phuljhar to remain in Raipur even though it has good communication with Bargarh during rains. I would like to draw your attention to Census Report of 1951. In that they have divided a Tahsil into two parts for presenting population figures e.g. Rural Tahasil A and Rural Tahasil B. The percentage of Oriya population in Tahsil A is 53. That Tahasil has four police-stations as Sariapal, Baisura etc. The Oriyas are in majority in those police-stations. We have not therefore made any unreasonable claim. The percentage of Oriya population in Baisura and Sariapal police-stations is 90 per cent. Let the river that indicates the boundary between Kalahandi and Raipur districts near Khariar Road, be the boundary line between Sambalpur and Raipur districts. Let the police-stations of Asan and Sariapalli situated at the upper level of the river be included in Orissa. In the five police-stations under Rural Taluk B. e.g. Raji, Gadibandh, Chorabandh, Dhebal etc. there are about 50,000 Oriyas, which is 18 percent of the total population. We do not claim all parts of Tahasil B except the police-stations like Nainpur, Dhebal etc. where the Oriya population is concentrated. The map of Orissa looks like a peninsula. Raipur is 120 miles from this Police station and subdivisional headquarters is 34 miles away whereas Dharmagarh subdivision of Kalahandi district of Orissa is only 6 miles from Dhebar and 46 miles from Nainpur. Considering the cultural and financial aspects those are the integral parts of Orissa and for all purposes it is Orissa. With Chandahandi outpost to the south and Chinapalli on the north, that area is like a peninsula entering into Orissa, and as such it should be included in Orissa. The Officers of Orissa go to Dharmagarh and Junagarh via. Kesinga Railway station and the officers from Raipur come through Bhawanipatna. Due to these difficulties the Postal Department of Government of India have made arrangements for the supervision of the District Post Office of Kalahandi by Head office at Sambalpur. All sorts of Postal articles of the police-stations like Orinal Dhebalpur etc. pass through Dharmagarh and Junagarh. Those areas should, therefore, be included in Orissa. At the times of the O' Donnell Committee in 1932 the Oriya population in Bindhra Nuagarh was 42 percent but now the percentage of their population is 60 to 65. The Committee at that time said that the people were ignorant and indifferent, but now after independence they have been conscious. They are anxious for inclusion in Orissa and gave evidence before the States Reorganisation Commission to this effect but it is a matter of great regret that the Commission have set aside our claims over those areas where the Oriya population forms the majority. Their ulterior motive is perhaps to establish a Hindi Imperialism. The proposed new State of Madhya Pradesh will comprise an area of 170 thousand square miles from which the Commission are even reluctant to allow incorporation of the predominantly Oriya-speaking areas with Orissa.

I will now speak about Bastar. Though the British Government included Baster in Chatisgarh for administrative conveience, its cultural pattern closely resembles with Orissa. The language spoken in Koraput district is also spoken in Bastar but they have named it Halbi. This Halbi language has much similarity with Oriya language. Mr Grierson has said "It is more akin to Maharastrian." The Chief Minister of Madhyaa Pradesh has acted very cleverly in holding a conference of poets at Jagadalpur before the arrival of States Reorganisation Commission and was successful in recording the opinion of noless a man than Srlnath Kumar Chatterjee that Halbi is more akin to Chhatisgadi. But the Commission have said that Bastar has no relationship with Koraput district.

Like Bastar, many such areas will be far away from the administrative units and consequently if there be any disorder in the farthest corner, no body would be present there to describe the woes and miseries at the Centre. In Bastar, the Oriya population being 10 percent we do not claim the entire district but we claim those areas of Baster where the Oriyas are concentrated in large numbers and which are contiguous to Koraput district.

I wish to say something about the southeren boundary. In South Orissa influential persons under the banner of the Utkal Sammilani raised their voice in favour of amalgamation. The claims of South Orissa are not of recent origin but goes as far back as the year 1903. The people of South Orissa have been struggling in spite of innumerable obstacles to merge with Orissa. They have held aloft the flag of the Oriya race even up to this day. The nationalism of Orissa and its culture is still present there. It is regrettable that the States Reorganisation Commission hold the view that the decisions of the O'Donnell Committee in regard to the southern boundary of Orissa are alright. But if the O'Donnell Committees recommendations, had actually been implemented Orissa would have got 2,000 square miles more of territory to-day. The O'Donnell Committee recommended that the Vizag agency should go to Orissa but the then Secretary of State for India cleverly interpreted the term Vizag agency to mean the Jeypore Estate. The Madras Government agreed to cede the impartible portion of the Jeypore Estate but retained the partible portion (the acquired Zamindari areas in Madras which comprises the Madgul, Padwa agency). Those areas which the O'Donnell Committee recommended for transfer to Orissa, should at least come to Orissa. They are mostly tribal areas. The Adibasis of those areas and those of Koraput belong to the same tribe. Their interests can never be safeguarded in Andhra because out of the total strength of 196 seats in the Andhra Legislature, the Scheduled Tribes have been represented only in 4 seats. So their language and culture is not safeguarded there. In the Orissa Legislative Assembly there are 20 members belonging to the Scheduled Tribes. We honour them and one of them is a Minister. Here their interests will be safeguarded as they live in an area contiguous to Orissa. So Sujankota, Gangaraj, Madgul, Parvatipuram agency, Birabhadra agency, etc., comprising an area of 2,000 square miles deserves to be merged with Orissa. The other Oriya-speaking areas of Tarala, Manjusa, Udyanakhanda should also come to Orissa. This is a general survey of the S. R. C. report.

Then, I shall deal with the public reaction in Orissa, on the publication of the report of the S. R. C. There is nothing about Orissa in the S. R. C. report. All that it contains about Orissa is irrelevant and the arguments they have advanced seem to have no principle behind them. When the States Reorganisation Commission report was published there was disappointment and resentment all over Orissa. That was manifested at Cuttack in consequence of which the report was burnt in a public meeting. Our Chief Minister while referring to the incident said that only the cover page of the report was burnt. Did he anticipate that all the copies ot the report available in India should have been burnt ? Was it not enough that the cover page of the report was burnt ? Was is not the symbol of our resentment ? We burnt also the photo of Utkal Gauraba Mr. Das, and it was symbolic. We, the people of Orissa, are peace loving. Rewa witnessed some ugly incidents, the Ministers were beaten, but we do not want to behave that way. We expressed our resentment in a peaceful manner. Sir, You know the Utkal Sammelani called on the people of Orissa to observe Hartal on the 18th October, 1955. On that day the Members of the Opposition did not attend the Assembly and it is a matter of great regret that our Chief Minister and some other Members of the Treasury Bench could come and take their seats in the Assembly Chamber.

It is a colosal betrayal to the nation. For this if their effigies are burnt, would it not be enough ? This burning of the Report, and the stopping of railway communication and the Statewide Hartal have created some reaction at the centre, which is a good omen for Orissa. I thank those who have done it. When the Provincial Congress Committe filed a petition and requested the Congress Working Committee to allow it to meet on a deputation and represent their grievances, the petition was rejected on the ground that no court-fee stamps were affixed to the petition. There is nothing to be rejected over this and there is still time to file a fresh petition. Now-a-days he who could demand and he who could shout achieves his objective. You must have seen the Report of the Commission. Consideration is nil there.

If you argue that they have done enough justice to Orissa, then I have nothing to say. It is an account of our reaction against the report that this question is being reopened today. If Orissa gets any justice it will be for her reactions only.

Shri NABAKRUSHNA CHOUDHURI (Chief Minister) Burn some more cover pages of the report.

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO; Mr. Speaker, Sir, our Chief Minister is tired and is perhaps feeling restless but I shall place before you a short history of what the Orissa Congress has done for the formation of a separate Orissa Province, quoting authority with facts and figures. I shall refer to the book "Ten years of Orissa". Its author is a very learned man Shri Harekrushna Mahtab and the Utkal Congress Committee is its publisher. It is printed by the Congress Press at Swaraj Ashram. I shall draw your attention to page 85 of that book. Shri Mahtab writes, "The Raja of Parlakimedi first openly raised this demand for a separate province at the Round Table Conference held in London. The British Policy was always directed to keep the Hindus and the Muhammadans divided by creating a rift between them. For that purpose the Muhammadan area of Sind was formed into separate province. To hold the balance even, a separate Hindu province of Orissa was created. Everybody will find out within a short period of time that Orissa is the loser from all sides. In the midst of the rejoicing of the people in having a separate province, Shri Nityananda Kanungo, Shri Nabakrishna Choudhuri and the author himself have frightened the people with a constant note of warning. Even if no body listens to them, they have been raising their voice against the separation of Orissa per force of habit.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if anybody has been benefitted by a separate province, it is these three persons. One of them is now a Governor, the other, the Chief Minister, Orissa, and the third a Union Minister. I shall tell you here how the Orissa Congress in 1933 sacrificed one after another the demands made for the amalgamation of all the outlaying Oriya speaking tracts. Although, the O'Donnell Committee were convinced that the Oriyas were in majority in Midanapur, we could not get it. That Committee have stated at page-6 of report "The transfer to Orissa nearly 1 1/2 million Hindus would reduce an appreciably, the existing Hindu majority in this part of Bengal and is naturally, therefore, unwelcome to Hindu politicians'.

In those days the Britishers stigmatised the Congress Leaders as Hindu politicians. There was no Hindu Mahasabha in Midanapore at that time.

Today, our claim to Midanapur has been burnt to asses at the instance of the Congress. Next I shall say about Singhbhum. Who has lowered the flag of Orissan culture, her language and interests, which had so passionately been held aloft since 1921 with the efforts ot Pandit Gopabandhu Das and Pandit Godavaris Misra till the year 1935 ? A reply would be welcome. It is clear from the resolution of the Congres Working Committee of 1953 that our Chief Minister, Naba Babu, who was a member of that Committee supported the resolution to separate the District Congress Committee of Singhbhum from the Utkal Pradesh Congress Committee and to place it under the Bihar Provincial Congress Committee.

The racial pride and cultural affinity of Orissa in Singhbhum, which was preserved with such care by the prolonged efforts of the Utkal Provincial Congress Committee for so many years and which could produce so able a person as Shri Bijayakumar Pani has been wiped away by the present Orissa Congress.

The soul of late Gopabandhu Das must be burning in agony today. The soul of late Madhusudan must also be crying in wilderness. but here our people are talking tall and are boasting of great Indian Nationalism. While speaking about Sareikela and Kharaswan, I am conscious of the reply that the Chief Minister would like to give. He would say that Sareikela and Kharaswan have been lost to Orissa, only due to the activities of the party patronised by the ex-Rulers. I would like to draw your attention to a short notice starred question asked by Shri A. C. Singh, Member of Congress Party, to the Chief Minister, Bihar. It was published in the **Hindustan Standard**, dated, the 17th February 1954.

"Shri Singh : Is it a fact that Shri Mahtab, the Chief Minister of Orissa................

Chief Minister ; The answer is in the positive."

Shri NABAKRUSHNA CHOUDHURI (Chief Minister) : The full details are available in Bihar Legislative Assembly Proceeding No. 22, Vol. 44 I will say all about that later on.

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : Whether that may be the matter has become old and I do not want to speak anything more on that.

Shri NABAKRISHNA CHOUDHURI (Chief Minister) Please have patience and wait for a little more. Many matters will be brought to light.

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : Let us now consider about the southern areas. Who is responsible for not claiming the areas that were once claimed in 1903 ? Who has authorised the Government for making such minimum demands ? I shall now read the resolution on the report of the State Reorganisation Commission. by the Utkal Provincial Congress Committee.

I have no objections if the people of Orissa could be satisfied with this minimum demand. But I know it for certain that the representatives from Ganjam district will never support this. Moreover, ours is a democratic State, and there should be administration of the people, for the people and by the people. But what we see here is that the administration is not of the Oriya people, for the Oriya people or by the Oriya people, inasmuch as the Oriyas have fallen far behind in the all fields of life, e.g., Government Service, trade, business, etc. Our State Re rganisation Commission have said that at least 50 per cent of the officers in All-India Service should be outsiders, but in our case, are there actually 50 per cent of our people among officers in All-India Service ? Everywhere such is the state of affairs. I would therefore like to ask the Chief Minister whether he would look to the interests of the nation or his Chief Ministership. The History of Orissa has proved once for all that the lives of 1,200 carpenters could not be sacrificed for one son.

Shri BIJOYKUMAR PANI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the report that we are considering in this House today is the problem of our life and death. The members of this Assembly have been given the opportunity of expressing their views over this problem. Before speaking on the question of boundary, I would like to say in a nutshell that when India was under the British rule, the Congress while piloting the struggle for the independence of India placed before the people from time to time their demands for formation of States on linguistic and cultural basis. The Congress had always upheld the view that the British Government had formed the Provinces as administrative Units for administrative convenience. The Congress told the British Government that our organisation represents the nation at large and we are not bound by your imaginary administrative units. After independence we got the opportunity to reorganise the States on the basis of language and culture. Unfortunately, soon after independence there was partition and India was split up into two parts, namely Hindustan and Pakistan. After independence a new danger faced the country. The Britishers had gone but the Feudatory States were left behind. The Feudatory States combined together and raised their heads and proclaimed themselves independent but fortunately all these ex-states merged with the territory of India under the powerful leadership of Sadar Patel. There were hundreds of such Feudatory States in India and one by one they all integrated. Even after integration of these States the old Kingship continued in some cases in some form or other. We should thank the States Reorganisation Commission for giving their wise counsel in some important problems. In India three classes of States as administrative units, e.g. Part A, B and C class exists. The Commission has recommended for abolition of this classification of States Further, they have suggested to abolish the provisions relating to the appointment of ex-rulers in some States as Rajpramukns and Upa Rajpramukhas and I wholeheartedly welcome their suggestion. Today we are independent. Our different States are being administered by one Central Union Government. But unfortunately parochial feelings have developed between neighbouring States forgetting they are under the Union. The minority in one State is always subject to oppression by the majority group in power. Observing such deplorable state of psychosis throughout the length and breadth of the country the Congress Government in Centre although they were committed to recasting of States during peace time on mutual understandings had to appoint with these three learned members of the present State Reorganisation Commission.

All will of course agreed with me and appreciate what the Commission have suggested in their Report are of immense value to the country so far it relates to the solidarity and unity of the country.

They have recommended for one class of States in India and for the abolition of the title of Rajpramukhs and Upa Rajpramukhs. They have also given their best consi-

derations in respect of the problems to minority people in the bilingual and trilingual areas and have given their suggestion for giving protection to them. The chapter containing these recommendations would undoubtedly be appreciated by every body.

While discussing the Report of the Commission so far it realates to Boundary adjustments, I would say that the Report has struck at the very root of Oriya nation and has brought in a sense of disappointment among the Oriya-speaking tracts. It is a pity that our reasonable arguments have not at all been taken into consideration. It is known that the Commission started their tour from Madras, come to Bihar after touring many other States and then came to Orissa. After Orissa they proceeded to Assam and from Assam to West Bengal and then to Himachal Pradesh. But probably they had forgotten all about Orissa by the time they began to write their Report and the facts relating to her. Thus they have dealt the case of Orissa in the last Chapter. In their Report they have made mention about Orissa most superficially. Under the pretest of Seraikala and Kharswan they have tried to divert the main issue. It was not wise and good of them, not to pay due consideration to our claim over Singhbhum which is a longstanding claim of Orissa. The reason for the same might be unaccountable but all the same it cannot be denied that it has hit use hard. At three different places they have dealt about Orissa in a haphazard manner. In the Chapter devoted to Bihar, they have dealt with the claims of Orissa on Bihar. It appears under paragraph 615 of their Report "The Orissa claim for the restoration to it of the Seraikela subdivision of the Singhbhum district." This they took to be the issue of conflict on boundary and they judged the claim of Orissa on Bihar. While disposing of the case of Bihar, they had in their view Saraikela and Kharaswan, only as Orissa's claim. The Singhbhum district comprises of three subdivisions, namely, Sareikela subdivision comprising Seraikela and Kharaswan, Sadar subdivision comprising Porahat and Kolhan and Dhalbhum subdivision. Orissa's claim over Singhbhum has been since a long time and so far as a I know the various organisations of Orissa had claimed whole of Singhbhum's merger with Orissa. The various political parties in Orissa, the Government of Orissa, the Singhbhum Utkal Sabha, the Oriyas and the Adibasis in Singhbhum, Utkal Provincial Congress Committee and Utkal Sammilan all have placed before the Commission their claims for the merger of Singhbhum district into Orissa. Our late Pandit Gopabandhu Das, one of the builders of the present Orissa, all along claimed Singhbhum to be an intergral part of Orissa. Out of 12 elected members to the Bihar Assembly from Singhbhum, eight members and submitted memoranda to the Commission for inclusion of Singhbhum district into Orissa. Of course, subsequently it is learnt under pressure one member withheld his consent later on. During the Commission's tour in Singhbhum, these seven members appeared before the Commission and forcefully demanded Singhbhum's merger with Orissa in the interest of Abidasis. The Singhbhum District Congress Committee was formed by the Utkal Congress Committee since 1919 till 1952 and the Singhbhum District Congress Committee placed this point as well before the Commission. The Mankis and the Mundas who are mostly Hos and are the headmen of their tribes have placed claims for merger of Singhbhum in Orissa before the States Reorganisation Commission during their Singhbhum tour. The President of Ho Mahasabha. Shri L. N. Manki, ex-Chairman of Singhbhum District Board and who is a sinior leader of Ho Community in Porahat and Kolhan along with his other collegues had appeared before the States Reorganisation Commission and placed the demand of Singh-bhum's merger with Orissa.

But it is surprising that the Commission have nowhere made any mention of it in their report. This leads me to think that when the Commission toured the other States after their Orissa tour, they perhaps, forgot that they had ever toured a State, Orissa by name. Eventually when the case of Orissa came to their mind, they reported about it in a most haphazard manner. The Commission has tried to divert the attention of the people of Orissa and have tried to console them by saying that the status quo in regard to Orissa has been maintained. The Commission while discussing the claims of Orissa have stated that the Government of Orissa have claimed for the restoration to it "The Singhbhum district of Bihar, particularly Sareikela and Kharaswan as far as I know, the Government of Orissa have not submitted any memoranda or advanced any arguments claiming for the inclusion of specifically Sareikela and Kharaswan in Orissa. I do not believe that any Political party or institution in Orissa has submited any memoranda or tendered evidence before the Commission demanding only Sareikela and Kharswan, without the district of Singhbhum. Only Sareikela and Kharswan do not, by themselves, constitute the Singhbhum district. Other areas are there in the Singhbhum district. Now I am going to speak about our boundary problem and our claim in regard to Singhbhum. What we all know Singhbhum Sadar is the old Porahat (New Khasmahal.) The Raja of Porahat was virtually known as the Raja of Singhbhum. The younger brother of the Raja of Porahat got Seraikela and Kharaswan as their share. The Commission while discussing the question of Singhbhum have stated that Seraikela and Kharaswan have historical and relationship with Porahat and administrative connections with Chotanagpur and so Seraikela and Kharaswan or any portion thereof cannot be included in Orissa. The Commission while discussing the history should have dealt with more remote historical incidents pertinent to the question, than to quote the report of the O'Donnell Committee as the only history available. While dicussing the history they should have made enquiry as to whether any Raj Durbar or people in any part of India is observing the 'SUNIA DAY' the new year's day of Puri Gajapati Raja etc. Sunia Ceremony is observed in the month of Bhadrab, as is being observed in the case of Oriya Raja and Oriya people. Sunia day is being observed by Singhbhum Rajas and Zamindars and also in Seraikela and Kharaswan.

While discussing the historical aspects they should have studied how Seraikela and Kharaswan has come down in history as a separate entity upto the present day. If the Raja of Porahat, Vir, Arjun Singh and Jagu Dewan had not joined the Sepoy Mutiny, and had acknowledged British suzerainty, then the history of Singhbhum would have taken a different course. The younger brothers of the Raja of Singhbhum or Porahat were also the rulers of Seraikela and Kharaswan at that time. For some reason or other, they refrined from taking any part in the Mutiny. The Mutiny borke out and the British Government tried to suppress the rebels. At that time Jagu Dewan who has an Oriya led the Oriyas to join the Mutiny. For that reason he was hanged to death from a tree, his other lieutenants were also brutally killed and Raja Arjun Singh was imprisoned for the whole of his life in Benaras. If the Sepoy Mutiny aad not taken place, the British Government would not have taken over the administration of Porahat. The Raja of Porahat, like any other Feudatory Chiefs of Orissa, could have maintained his separate entity and Porahat would have been treated as an Oriya Feudatory State. In order to suppress the rebellious people of Singhbhum, the British Government had to move their troops from Ramgarh in Hazaribagh district. Further they had to move their offices from Hazaribagh and Ranchi to Singhbhum. Because those areas had already been conquered by them before hand. Thus the existence of Singhbhum as an entity and its Oriya culture had to face various opposing forces from time to time through the vicissitudes of fortune. I can say, that you cannot imagine their present plight. But in spite of all that they could declare into the world, in some way or other that "Look here Oriyas are still living here". The Oriyas and Adivasis are the original inhabitants of Singhbhum, but as Singhbhum is under the Bihar administration, the census figures in regard to Oriyas are being suppressed as a result of which a class of 'people called 'doubtfuls' were created. In 1931 Census, which preceded the O'Donnell Committee, these doubtful class comprised the Oriya population of Singhbhum. Singhbhum was first under the Bengal Government for some time then it remained under the Bihar and Orissa Government for some time and lastly under the Bihar Government and that is why the number of Oriyas there has dwindled under each successive administrations. Thus the number of Oriya inhabitants has been misrepresented.

Then Sir, I shall speak about the 'Minimum' demand which I have included in my amendment to the motion. Of course there was a time when the Orissa empire or the Kalinga empire extended from the Ganges to the Godavari. That Kharavela empire extended to a great part of India. I do not like to go back to those past days of Orissa and our present demand stands on such tracts which are purely Oriya. Tract like any other part of present Orissa and where the people are anxious to come back to Orissa, who feel that they have been dismembered and spearated from their mother land. We must demand strongly for the inclusion of those areas as our demand is just and legitimate.

Mr. Speaker Sir, our claim is not confined to only Seraikela and Kharaswan, but Sadar Singhbhum and Seraikela subdivision. The population of both the subdivisions, i. e., Sadr and Seraikela is 870,743 out of which the Oriya population is 154,088. The number of Hos in this area is 396,984, the number of Hindi-speaking people is 58,114 and the number of

(

Bengali-speaking people is 74,127. From this you will find that ext to the Hos, the Oriyas constitute the largest language group. I like to state that the Hos are willing to remain in Orissa The Adibasis of Singhbhum disitrict want to merge with Orissa. They have been closely associated with Orissa. On these considerations, we demand that the Sadar subdivision and Seraikela subdivision of Singhbhum should be included in Orissa.

Sir, on study of the Census of 1951 for the whole of Singhbhum, now let us consider as to why there has been increase of Hindi-speaking people in Singhbhum. You know Sir, the Tata Iron and Steel Company at Jamshedpur in Singhbhum district is one of the biggest factories in India. It depends on and exploits the natural resources of Orissa. There are also some other industrial places including the Cement Factory situated in Chaibasa. All these factories are manned with a large number of Hindi-speaking workers from Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, etc., besides those of Bihar districts. The Superintendent of Census Operation of 1951 has expressed his opinion unequivocally that the reason for the increase of Hindi-speaking people in Singhbhum district is due to immigration. Out of the total Hindi population of 213,000 in that district the number of immigrants is about 180,000. As such the real number of Hindi-speaking people even in the whole of the district is 33,000. It is unfortumate that with regard to some places the States Reorganisation Commission have fixed the boundary on linguistic considerations, at some they have taken in accounts floating population and at other places they have advanced separate arguments for not changing the boundary only on linguistic considerations. At some places they have taken the linguistic considera tions as the measuring rod and accordingly have made re-adjustments in the boundary line but when the question of Singhbhum came they said that did not think it fit to transfer any portion of the said district to Orissa. But while considering the cases of other States, the Commission has not hesitated to recommended transfer of even Taluks and Sub-Taluks. Here lies the wonderful characteristic of the Commission. Injustice is the outcome of such wonders. But I am confident that our national Government will remedy the wrong done to us and will create confidence in the minds of those who are the oppressed. While moving the motion, the Finance Minister has already explained that the situation in Singhbhum has undergone a great change and it is not the same that prevailed 23 years back when the O'Donnell Committee had considered the issue. Over and above I have the honour to bring to your notice the news item published in the Newspapers of the 27th November where it has been reported that the Ex-Leader of Opposition Shri S. Hembrom, M. L. A. from Singhbhum in the Bihar Legislative Assembly has demanded the inclusion of Singhbhum Sadr and Seraikela subdivision in Orissa in a motion of amendment. He was the accredited Leader of the Opposition in the Bihar Assembly until he submitted a memorandum in this respect. I know Sir, the Adibasis of Singhbhum have realised that "Shri Jaypal Singh instigated them under the bogus bogey of Jharkhand a separate State" their attentioh was diverted and their interests sacrificed. But now they are aware of their homogeneity and all round prosperity lies in Orissa only. Shri Hembrom has said that "Singhbhum is predominantly an Adibasi area and the Hos are in majority among the Adibasis. In the interest of the Hos and the Oriyas, living side by side with Hos, aforesaid areas should be transferred to Orissa". It is therefore. now. clear that Singhbhum Sadr and Seraikela is to be included in Orissa not in the interests of Oriyas only but in ther interest of Hos as well. Sir, Singhbhum is a part of Orissa. The Hos are found to only in Singhbhum Sadr, Seraikela and Kharswan but also in other districts of Orissa such as Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar, Sundargarh, etc. There are also a large unmber of Hos in Cuttack district and they have migrate more south upto Koraput district. The Hos of Singhbhum have the tendency to move towards the South. Purulia sub division of Mayurbhanj district is just on the north of Singhbhum and the boundary of Singhbhum is the river Subarna-rekha, Here after crossing Subarnarekha river you will find in Purulia subdivision the number of Hos is only 3, whereas in Mayurbhanj district just on the south of Singhbhum their number is about 117,552. In the district of Ranchi on the north-west of Singhbhum their number was 104, according to Census Report of 1931. The reason was that many of the Hos are serving as constables and petty clerks and are being transferred to other districts of Bihar. In 1951 it rose to only 4 520 which is due to the industries and Damodar Valley Corporation. In spite of all these industrial develop ments in Chotnagpur they do not find scope and are never attracted for going north of Singhbhum. Their number in Mayurbhanj district to the south of Singhbhum is a out of 117,000, in Keonjhar 75,650, in Dhenkanal 3,627 and in Sundargarh 13,334. With these facts before you, you will see for yourself that very few have gone to the State of Bihar only to earn their livelihood as it is an industrial area. Even the location of Tata Iron and Steel Co., at Jamshedpur in Dhalbhum has not provided then the means of livelihood and they are only about 3.000. There is close relationship between the Adibasis and Hos of Sadr subdivision of Singhbhum, Seraikela and Kharaswan with those of Orissa. In Orissa they have their matrimonial cultural, economic and social relationships. They do not desire to remain in Bihar, 9 months provisions in a year, are improted to Singhbhum from the contiguous districts of Orissa. Rice, blackgrams (Biri)and green-grams(Mung), etc., from Orissa are generally sold in the markets of Singhbhum. Unless foodgrains supplies come from Orissa, the people of Singhbhum will have to starve for 9 months in a year, as it is a deficit area. Our memorandum will give a clear picture in these respects. I am not going to repeat the same and take the time of the House. The old English Officers have administrated in various reports that the trade and commerce of Orissa is interlinked with the district of Singhbhum. The ex-rulers of Orissa had close and even matrimonial relationship with the ex-rulers of Singhbhum. Many Depoty Commissioners of Singhbuhum and high officials of no less a person than Mr. Phillips have admitted that Singhbhum is an Oriya district. While considering the issue there appears to be no cogent reasons to tag on Singhbhum on with Bihar. when Bihari population in Singhbhum is a negligible one. I would, therefore, say that in the sake of justice and in the interests of Oriyas as well as Adibasis if not whole Singhbhum district at least Sadr and Seraikela subdivisions of Singhbhum should be included in Orissa. While considering the claim of Orissa over Singhbhum the Commission while confining the claim to Seraikala subdivision have stated that the Oriyas do not seem to be concentrated anywbere. This is a glaring instance to prove that Oriyas are not found in any pocket of the Singhbhum with concentrated population but they are spread over the entire area and I will emphatically say Sir, you won't find any village without Oriya population. The Oriyas and the Adibasis reside side by side in the villages of Sadr and Seraikela subdivisions and in any village you would find if some are Hos and other Adivasis their next neighbours are Oriya potters. weavers, cowherds (Gowalas) and other Oriya artisan families. The Commission should have taken these matters into consideration from that aspect. The minimum and the justifiable claims of the Oriyas and the Adibasis are that Singhbhum Sadr, Seraikela and Kharaswan should be transferred to Orissa. Very few Hos are working in the industrial centres like Jamshedpur, etc. The Tata Iron and Steel Company exploits the raw materials from Orissa and produces the finished products in steel and that has stood as barrier for giving justice to Orissa. Raw materials in managanese, limestone and chromite, etc., go from Orissa which have made Jamshedpur to grow into an industrial city. Even if Jamshedpur and Dhalbhum is retained in Bihar there can be no argument against the inclusion of Sadr subdivision of Singhbhum, Seraikela and Kharaswan in Orissa. It is due to this that I have minimised our claims and have restricted to Singhbhum Sadr, Seraikela and Kharaswan only.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, does the Commission mean to convince us that they refrined from recommending the inclusion of Singhbhum in Orissa as that might have dissatisfied the Biharis for they had in their view the suggestion for inclusion of the Purulia subdivision of the district of Manbhum in West Bengal ? I would, therefore. say for equitable justice the reasonable claims of Orissa should be taken into cosideration. It is no good to set aside the rightful claim by opening up an old and imaginary argument. It is most unfortunate that the Commission constituted in an Independent India, have not taken these matters into consideration. The party which now guides the destiny of the country have always assured the people that they are not prepared to accept the administrative units set up by the Britishers with artificial boundaries. Our aim had all along been to recast the States on linguistic and cultural basis. The S. R. C. was appointed with this end in view but it is a matter of shame and regret that the Commission while considering the case of Singhbhum have tried to divert our attention from the main issue by advancing a 23-year-old argument of the O'Donnell Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, let us now analyse the recommendations of the O'Donnell Committee, when the O'Donnell Committee was appointed, the then Orissa Division of Bihar and Orissa consisted of the districts of Cuttack, Puri, Balasore and then Sambalpur. The Orissa Division was formed with

these four districts with the ex-state areas forming a barrier in between. At that time the Oriyas of Singhbhum demanded inclusion with Orissa but the O'Donnell Committee that Singhbhum had neither any geographical contiguity with Orissa nor was there any facilities of communication and further the Hos who form the majority in Singhbhum are opposed to come to Orissa and therefore though Singhbhum was admittedly an Oriya-speaking area, the Committee did not include it in Orissa. The Orissa of 1932 does not exist now. The Commission should have considered that the ex-state areas which were forming a barrier as against contiguity, do not exist now in India. How could they expect such barriers in the case of Orissa in 1955. Today, Orissa covers three sides Singhbhum and Seraikela whereas Bihar is only on the north-west. Let us now see what is their views from the geographical standpoint. A learned member of the Commission while taking evidence pointed out that he had to cross a mountainous range to reach Singhbhum from Ranchi. In fact, a range of mountains which separates Singhbhum from Ranchi and other areas of Chotanagpur. The Singhbhum plateau is physically contiguous to Orissa. A member of the Commission of his own accord casually referred to it. But on a perusal of the Report it appears that the Commission have not taken into account those factors nor have they tried to acquaint themselves with the real position while considering the case of Singhbhum. In regard to Singhbhum, the Commission have based their recommendations mainly on the geographical factors. In case their recommendations are given effect to, one has to pass through 22 miles of hilly tracts and mountainous ranges in order to reach Patna by road, the capital of Bihar from Singhbhum. There is no other communication except this. But in the case of Orissa there is no such difficulty. Singhbhum district is connected to almost each of the northern district of Orissa. An all-weather road connects Chaibasa from Cuttack via Keonjhar and Champua. Another road connects the district of Sundargarh and Sambalpur from Rourkela to Barajamda and Gua. There is also an all-weather road connecting Singhbhum Sadar with Baripada and Balasore. Apart from this there are quite a good number of fair-weather roads connecting Singhbhum Sadar and Seraikela with rest of Orissa I doubt if the learned Commission have understood anything as to what geographical position means. Perhaps to them it is something different, while deciding the claims of Orissa. From the geographical standpoint, no portion of Singhbhum and Seraikela and Kharaswan should be part of Bihar. It is sheer injustice to take those portions with Bihar under the pretext of facilities of communication and railway. The Commission have cited the arguments from the Report of O' Donnell Committee. But in this connection it is to be borne in mind that the British Government then in power desired to keep Sinbhghum under their direct control as the people of Singhbhum took leadership in the Sepoy Mutiny. They kept Singhbhum separated from Orissa. They had their 'divide and rule' policy as otherwise they would not have shown us the most circuitous route via Kharagpur in order to reach Cuttack. Patna, the capital of Bihar, is 300 miles from Chaibasa, the headquarter of Singhbhum District whereas Cuttack is nerely 200 miles from Chaibasa by road. Where the Commission not aware that in the event of their recommendations being given effect by transferring Purulia sub division to West Bengal, there is not even an inch of rail link from Singhbhum to the rest of Bihar within the boundaries of Bihar and that it is very difficult to reach Patna without touching West Bengal ? In the case of Bihar, the Commission have admitted that the Merhatti-speaking people from the majority there but as there is easy communication to Telengana through rails and roads and therefore, have suggested for the inclusion of Bihar in Telengana. In the Bihar the percentage of peoples speaking Marhati is 39, Khandi 29, Urdu 16, and below that Telugu speaking people are only 15 per cent. Communication is the criterion here to decide in favour of Telengana. The very same arguments should have been applied while considering the case of Singhbhum. The commission would have then realised that no State other than Orissa has got proper communication and rail link for administration of Singhbhum. The rail-link from Orissa goes up to Singhbhum from Seraikela and the roads described by me are also there. Chaibasa is also connected with Badbil by rail Besides proposals are also there to connect Badbil with Rourkela by rail and Rourkela with Talcher in the Second Five-Year Plan. From this point of view Singhbhum should be included in Orissa. This is all that I had to say regarding geographical stand point.

Then Sir, the O' Donnell Committee alleged that the people of Singhbhum to be a little more explicit, the Hos who are in majority there, opposed the merger with Orissa. I personally known Sir, that Shri Hembrom, M.L.A., the ex-leader of the Opposition in the Bihar Assembly claimed before the Commission along with six of his M.L.A., collegues, for the inclusion of Singhbhum in Orissa. Their argument was that Orissa, in the past, meant the districts of Puri, Cuttack, Balasore and Sambalpur. Each of the ex-States like Mayurbhanja, Keonjhar, Bonai , Bamra were a separate unit by themselves in Orissa. At present some members of each famil in Singhbhum are also residing in Keonjhar, Mayurbhan Banai. Dhenkanal, Sukinda in Cuttack district and even the have extended as for as the village Chhagan near Choudwar, on the bank of Mahanadi opposite to Cuttack city. In consideration of betterment of their economical condition they desire that Singhbhum should be transferred to Orissa. So now the old O' Donnell Committee cannot be quoted. The Adibasis want land. The density of population in Bihar is 572 per square mile, whereas just to the south of Singhbhum, in Keonjhar it is 183, in Sundargarh 146 and in Mayurbhanj 256. Singhbhum in full of hills and forests. No more cultivable lands are available there. The density of population there is 350 per squaremile. If the Commission are sincere to do good to the Adibasis, and also to better the economical condition of those, who could reclaim lands they should have recommended for inclusion of Singhbhum in Orissa, in the interest of the Adibasis of Singhbhum. It is regrettable that the Commission have not taken these pertienent problems into their considertion and have set aside our claims under the pretext of the O' Donnell Committee and further on the consideration that Dhalbhum will be an enclave. It is disastrous to argue in an Independent India that there is no necessity to review the decisions of the O' Donnell Committee as it had considered the case of Singhbhum in all its aspects. In that case the Commission itself admits that there was no necessity and justification to constitute this Commission by the India Government to recommend the reorganisation of States.

Mr Speaker Sir, I hope the Government of India will give their fullest consideration to the injustice done to us. The Government of India appointed this Committee with a view to solving the various problems arising in the Union. The Commission have not given their due consideration to the case of Singhbhum the life and death queston of people of that area. I hope the Government of India will reconsider the demand of the people of Singhbhum to merge with Orissa from the stand-point of unity and solidarity. In the course of his speech, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has said about many things. But I want to point it out to him that the question should not be considered from any party stand-point, rather we should discuss it, as being our life and death problem. If we discuss the question with irresponsibility here, it will produce a reaction the burnt of which will bear upon the outlying Oriya-speaking tracts in Bihar. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition had himself experienced at Seraikela. He should remember under what circumstances the Orissa have so far preserved their existence in Singhbhum. The matter should be considered from that point of view. In his speech he has challenged the sincerity of the Provincial Congress Committee on Oriyas boundary issue. Does he think that the occasion has presented him an opportunity to expose the Congress Committee to gain his political ends. Speaker, Sir, if we further discuss the matter, it will be repetition of hisory. Will the Commission deny that when the people rose in revolt against the Kingship in Seraikela and Kharaswan, it was not virtually directed by the Utkal Provincial Congress Committee. The Singhbhum District Congress Committee then was under the Utkal Provincial Congress Committee for all purposes. I am say with pride, that as an office bearer of the Singhbhum District Congress Committee and also as an office bearer of the Utkal Provincial Congress Committee I started the people's movement in Seraikela and Kharaswan and also led the same. Unfortunately if the ex-Rulers, had not set a foot the anti-merger and pro-union movement Bihar would not have been exposed in all her ugliness and made a suprising appearance in the field of Seraikela and Kharaswan. When the people's movement was going on Bihar Congress was not in the picture and they have no contribution in this historic movement. Even when the Orissa States were merged at Cuttack by Sardar Patel, Bihar was not in the picture. It is of no use to repeat an old story. Now the time has come when all of us should combine and unanimously decide as to the course of action to be adopted to get our genuine demand fulfilled and bring back our beloved brothern, living in the outlying areas into the lap of their mother-Utkal. We should muster strong and chalk out our programme. We should bring together our dismembered

regions over which we had justifiable claim and make it a perfect entity. Since long Britishers kept us dismembered and separate. It is no good to expose either the Provincial Congress Committee or the Ganatantra Praishad or the Communist Party. Every body knows that the Bihar Communist Party is manned by the Biharis. They have expressedly admitted without a shade of fear or doubt that Bihar has no claim whatsoever over Singhbhum Sadar and Seraikela and Kharswan and that Orissa's claims in regard to these areas are just and indisputable and they are of opinion that these areas should be included in Orissa. Let every Hon'ble Member of the House consider how best we can make our demands heard by the higher authorities and secure due justice from them.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is no good recalling what Dr. Mahtab said, what Shri N. K. Chaudhuri had said or what Shri N. Kanungo had said. In 1932 the O' Donnell Committee submitted their report about Orissa. Many said that they should not have a mutilated province and others said that we should accept it, and agitate for the inclusion of outlying tracts. It is regrettable that in recalling the history of the amalgamation movement none has said anything about Pandit Gopabandhu Das. late Utkalmani Gopabandhu Das was himself the Utkal Congress and the Utkal Congress was Utkalmani Gopabandhu Das. He was the life force of this province. He regarded the amalgamation of the outlying Oriya tracts as a national problem and devoted his life for it and if, to-day we say that the Utkal Congress was not connected with, it, then we would be committing a great sin.

Mr. Speaker Sir, we cannot achieve our ends by exposing other political parties. Therefore, I should say that since it is our national problem we should view it from that angle. But I would like to draw their attention to the matters incidential to the historical Sepoy Mutiny how and what led the Britishers to keep Porahat and other areas of Singhbhum, including Seraikela and Kharswan, under the administration of Chotnagpur. Perhaps in 1897 the Singhbhum district first came under the administration control of Bengal Government. Only in 1916. Seraikela and Kharswan passed on to the Department of the Political Agent of the Orissa Feudatory States. Zamindar Shri Laxminarayan Singh Deo along with the other Zamindars of Singhbum joined the Utkal Sammilani. All those Zamindars including the Raja of Porahat claimed before the Bihar and Orissa Government that their subjects were Oriyas and they should be merged with Orissa. But only the demands of Seraikela and Kharswan were acceded to and both the States were included in the Orissa. Feudatory States. Nothing was decided in respect of the rest. At that time Bihar was silent over the question. Orissa was separated from Bihar in 1936. In 1943 Orissa had a separate University of its own. Before this all the educational instititons of those areas were under the Patna University. After Utkal University came into existance those institutions of Seraikela and Kharswan were affiliated to it. The authorities of Bihar did not raise any objection then. In 1947 we find the historical merger of the Orissa States. The Rulers of Seraikela and Kharswan signed the merger agreements. This incident took place at Orissa Rajbhavan. Even. then the Government of Bihar was not particular about it. All on a sudden Bihar exploited the situation to their advantage. They instigated the Adibasis and created trouble. as a result of which Sareikela and Kharswan were detached from Orissa and placed under Bihar administration. Mr. Speaker Sir, in this connection I may remind the House that Shri Jaipal Singh, M.P., started the Jharkhand movement. Soon after the population of the Report of the State Reorganisation Commission all his statements and public speeches are directed towards the maintenance of the territorial integrity of Bihar and are given wide publicity in the newspaper of that State. By doing so he has made it clear that he has. for all time to come. bade farewell to his cherished Jharkhand movement. The Jharkhand movement of Shri Jaipal Singh is nothing but a pro-Bihar move in disguise which has been corroborated from the recent speeches of Jaipal Singh. I hope that the Government of India will take all necessary steps to save the Adibasis and other people of Singhbhum from such political exploitations.

There had been much discussion in the House in regard to the Oriya-speaking areas in Madhya Pradesh. The arguments that have been advanced by the Commission regarding Phuljhar, Bindra-Nuagarh etc , are equally rediculous. This is a complex question which has not received due consideration There are certain areas of Madhya Pradesh enclaved in Orissa, which are for practical purposes administered by our Government. These enclaves have no connection with Madhya Pradesh. In the case of Singhbhum, the Commission expressed their apprehension that, Dhalbhum including Jamshedpur would be an enclave if the Singhbhum Sadar subdivision or any portion thereof is merged with Orissa. But they have not taken into consideration the case of these enclaves of Madhya Pradesh in Orissa. From all this it will be evident that they have considered Orissa's claim to these areas in a most superficial manner. Had they seriously considered these matters they should have recommended for the transfer of Phuljhar, Bindra-Nuagarh, etc., to Orissa. They have referred to the O' Donnel Committee Report in this connection. Conditions were quite different then. That Committee was appointed by the British Government. The said Committee made its recommendations from a different point of view. But the States Reorganisation Commission which was appointed after independence of the country. should have reviewed these questions considering the changed conditions. By simply adhering to the O' Donnell Committee's recommendations they have made it rediculous. None can gainsay that Phuljhar, Bindhra-Nuagarh etc. are predominantly Oriya-speaking areas and the Harijans. the Gonds and other tribal people inhabiting these areas have their kith and kin in Kalahandi Bolangir and Sambalpur districts of Orissa.

Now I come to Bastar. The Andhras had also claimed Bastar, while considering the claims of Andhra, the Commission have said "This claim of Baster however, cannot be conveniently conceeded, if as is proposed later the claim to Koraput is rejected". Sir you are aware how the Commission while rejecting the claims of Andhras over Koraput and Bastar have admitted the akinness of these two districts. The reason put forward to separate this unity and close relationship is not sound and we are here to discuss about it. The claim of Orissa are justified in so far as the four taluks of Bastar are concerned. The Orissa and the Oriyas fervently hope that they will get justice from the Government of India. The mutilated and dismembered Orissa will then reach its perfection. While speaking this I remember about one thing. In near future this report will be discussed by the Lok Sabha and the Council of States. The Government of India are also considering this very minutely I also went to Delhi as a member of the delegation of the Utkal Provincial Congress Committee along with other members of the delegation. I am convinced that the Government of India have come to realise our reasonable claims. From that point of view the Congress Working Committee are now reviewing the boundary issue without brushing it aside as a trifling matter. They are attaching much importance to it. I am confident that in considering our reasonable claims they cannot dismiss it on flimsy grounds. With this I request all the members of this House to bear in mind that it is our national problem. We will put forth our demand in such manner which will not leave room for discontent among the Oriyas but will help in bringing back into our midst our brothers and sisters of the outlying Oriya tracts.

Shri HARIHAR MISRA : Sir, the subject about which we are now going to discuss does not confine itself to only Cuttack, Puri, Balasore Sambalpur and Koraput but his concerns the entire State and it is a problem of life and death for us. This has already been made clear by my previous speakers and I entirely agree with them. In the year 1936, a separate Province for Orissa was created as a result of our demand for amalgamation of Oriya outlying tracts. Before the creation of a separate Province. Orissa had only four districts, namely—Cuttack, Puri, Balasore and Sambalpur. No portion was added from Bengal, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh. Only the districts of Koraput and Ganjam from the Madras Presidency were amalgamated to constitute a separate Province for Orissa. At that time the boundaries of Madras extended up to Ganjam. Shri Biswanath Das, a Congress Member of the locality along with few others led a movement to bring back the outlying Oriya tracts for a sepsrate province. But the Congress workers from Cuttack side were lukewarm about this. At that time a public meeting was held at Cuttack in order to consider whether a separate Province with six districts only would be acceptable—our Congress friends from Cuttack strongly opposed it on the ground that such a truncated province will not be beneficial for the future of Orissa. But the people of Ganjam and Koraput and many other congress and noncongress leader of Orissa supported this because we though if we have a separate province, and if our people will take the leadership of such a province and if there will be a separate Governor for us, we could start our demand for a fuller province with all the outlying Oriya tracts where the Oriyas are struggling hard to keep their own hearts and souls together under great distress. We thought that we could make no effective demand being divided and weak and living in four different provinces. With this hope we agreed to the creation of a separate province

even though with six districts.

But it is a matter of regret that ever since the creation of a separate province in 1936 upto the appointment of the States Reorganisation Commission in 1953, our Government have not taken any step for bringing back the outlying tracts of Orissa to our State. On the other hand our Government agreed to the claims made by Madras while fixing the boundary between Orissa and Madras with regard to many villages of Orissa which were than in Madras to remain in Madras only. Madras got back its villages which were in Orissa but our Government did not consider it desirable to bring back those few of our villages which are lying still in Andhra. From this it is to be seen whether the people of our State have still any grounds for supporting the existing Government or the leaders. A separate province was created, a Cabinet was formed and it is not known what should have happened if the very people who were opposed to the need of having a separate province had not come forward to take up the reigns of administration in their hand. If the people who were in favour of a separate province had formed the Government, it is not known whether they would or would try for amalgamation of the remaining outlying Oriya tracts. But it is a matter of regret that the people who were oppose to the idea of having a separate province came to power and took no steps for its expansion. Now the time has come for all of us to combine and do everything necessary to bring together all the outlaying Oriya-speaking areas. It is not the time to discuss what has already been done or has been omitted to have been done. I entirely agree with what has been said by Shri Pani but all the same I want to discuss why all this is happning. If we say that we do not require a separate province, and we should remain with Bengal as Bengal has already progressed much and by remaining with Bengal, we will also automatically progress to a great extent that would be a completely different thing.

We desired a separate province with great hopes. We wanted to have our own separate existence. But we did not form a separate province only to quarrel among ourselves. It is never desirable on our part to oppose one another though we may hold different views. In that connection I do not of course mean to depreciate the present policy of the Congress Party. But the manner in which we are working today would not contribute to the progress in our State and its people. This state of affairs should not be allowed to continue for ever. The country needs some change and then only we can do some good to our country. When the Congress had its birth in Orissa and when the people of Orissa for the first time joined the organisation, the Congress established the Utkal Pradesh Committee in Orissa to carry out its programmes. At that time the Singhbhum District Congress Committee was placed under the jurisdiction of the Utkal Pradesh Congress Committee and Bastar was included under the Jeypore District Committee. That arrangement was made by the then Congress leaders. These were facts and not fiction. If Bastar did not belong to Orissa, the Congress leaders could have placed it under the jurisdiction of Raipur Congress Committee. Had Bastar been a Hindi-speaking area, there was no reason to tag it with Koraput instead of keeping it under the Raipur Congress organisation. Similarly, had Singhbhum been a Hindi-speaking area that would have been placed under the jurisdiction of the Bihar Pradesh Congress Committee. The then Congress leaders of Bihar have now become the top ranking Congress leaders. It is not that they did not endeavour then to have Singhbhum under the jurisdiction of the Bihar Pradesh Congress Committee. But the top-ranking Congress leaders of that time rejected their claims and placed Singhbhum under the jurisdiction of the Utkal Pradesh Congress Committee. That arrangement continued not for a year or two but for several years. But in the year 1948 the Congress all at once decided to place the Singhbhum District Congress Committee under the Bihar Pradesh Congress Committee. Of course our Pradesh Congress Committee also adopted the resolution to the effect that such a decision was unfair. The All-India Congress Working Committee turned deaf ear to it. The Orissa Congress Party was bound by that decision. Similarly we had also to part with Bastar which went under Raipur Congress Committee. If in this way we continue to loss our hold on our areas, in the longrun we will lose our existence itself. It is therefore necessary that our Government as well as the Pradesh Congress Committee should revise their view point. **The States Reorganisation Commission report that has now come out contains only two to four lines regarding Orissa's claim. The Commission have not arrived at any decision on Orissa after thorough discussion of the memorandum submitted by the Government, the Pradesh Congress Commitee,** the Ganatantra Parishad and other Political organisations of the State of Orissa. Instead of putting fourth counter arguments and rejecting the claims of Orissa they finished thire work citing O' Donnell Committee Report to their rescue. The British Government had formed the Indian provinces from the stand point of their own interest. That is why the Congress had to take a decision to reorganise the State on linguistic basis and that is why the States Reorganisation Commission was set up. Then why again depend on the O'Donnell Committee report ? Although the situation in the country has undergone a great change, we have still do depend on the same old decisions of the O' Donnell Committee. The Maharaja of Kalahandi has quoted some portions of the memorandum submitted by the Pradesh Congress Committee. The Pradesh Congress Committee have stated that the British Government with a view to divide the Hindus and the Muslims created the province of Sind for the Muslims and Orissa for the Hindus The Congress had all along claimed to keep the Hindus as well as the Muslims together. It is clear from the papers that Mahatma Gandhi vehemently opposed the division of India into Hindustan and Pakistan by the British Government. We cannot change our principles according to our own convenience. In that case we will have no principle at all. Those who cannot remedy the injustice done through agitation or movement, they will have to keep quit. Many speakers have already spoken on the Singhbhum issue. But in this connection I ask why have our Government placed a minimum demand before this House. We do not claim of course the entire area stretching from the Ganga upto the Godavari. Even if we claim that nobody would fulfil our claims. But the minimum demand that has been made must be fulfilled. Our Chief Minister, Education Minister, Congress Leaders and specially one of the Hon'ble Members of the House, Shri Bijayakumar Pani had been to Delhi to represent Orissa's claims. If they give us an assurance that we will definitely get back the Sadar sub-division of the Singhbhum district, Seraikela, Kharswan, our claimed portions of C. P. and Bastar, we will give up our claims on other outlying tracts. But if as a consequence of this minimum demand the authorities give us only the Sankara tracts and say that your minimum demand has been fulfilled, we will be nowhere. Why should we at all make a minimum demand ? Which of our claims are unreasonable or weak ? The outlying Oriya tracts adjacent to the Koraput district and some tracts adjacent to the Ganjam district have been left out. The Andhras may dislocate train communication in their area or destroy intermediary railway stations. The Central Government are afraid of their agitational spirit. They think that there would be the end of all creation if the interests of Andhra are affected. Similarly Bihar is taking recourse to goondaism has harassed as well as beaten us. When we represented our case before the Government of India, the Central Home Minister expressed his helplessness. He further said that Shri Nabakrishna Choudhuri and Shri Shrikrushna Sinha would settle up this dispute by mutual consent. If a "Naba Shri" talk is arranged, "Naba" being an Oriya will show his left cheek on being slapped on the right. The matter would end there. Hence I think it has not been proper for the Central Government to leave the matter to a "Naba Shri" talk.

The Central Government say that if the States come to an agreement on mutual discussion in a spirit of "give and take" that would be acceptable to them ; otherwise they would accept the States Reorganisation Commission report in toto. Neither Bihar nor Central Provinces would part with the Sadr subdivision of Singhbhum, Seraikela, Kharswan and Bastar respectively on our simple demand. So it is not understood how the matter can be amicably settled in a spirit of give and take. We have based our claims on sound reasoning and it was for the Commission to tell us how they rejected our arguments. But instead they have whimsically rejected our strong claims. The Oriyas are not agitative by nature. In fact they want to live in peace. The Central Government and the men in high command neglect Orissa for this reason only. But I should say that they are wrong in their impression about Orissa which can be removed at any time. There is a limit to everything. Orissa knows how to launch a movement. The Paikas of Khurda in Orissa were once the torch bearers of a great revolution. A revolution was also started at Angul in Orissa. The people of Khondmal who are now in Orissa had also created a revolution. So unless the boundary question of Orissa is peacefully settled and her legitimate claim is fulfilled, she would surely start a revolution which the Central Government could hardly be able to control.

Shrijukta Pani has said that this has given pain to the minds of the public of Orissa. This in fact turned all of us

mad. There is nothing to be surprised if the report is burnt or trampled under such circumstances. Who knows, even more serious and worse types of unrest might also grow up, if the wrong done to Orissa is not remedied. Let God give us good sense not to start such commotion. Let the Central Government give us justice in consideration of our claims. The Commission has suggested in their report with regard to Orissa that they do not think it proper to distrub the boundaries of the district of Srikakulam as the number of Telugu-speaking people there are more then the Oriya-speaking people. But they have not considered how the Srikakulam district was formed. Srikakulam was within the Vizagapatam district. Even after the merger of Ganjam with Orissa, many years ago the North Vizag. district was formed with Srikakulam. Gajapatinagar, Salur, Parvatipuram and other taluks. This has afterwards been named as Srikakulam district. If the Commission would have rejected our arguments after considering the number of Telugu speaking and Oriya-speaking people in our claimed areas that would have made us to think that our arguments were discussed, but our claims could not be upheld. They took into account all the different Telugu-speaking areas in different States and suggested a bigger State for them. Compared to that our demands are very moderate. If we attach so much importance to the O'Donnell Committee why should we not take into account what has been stated previously by Phillip Duff Commission and other I.C.S. Officers ? The Committee have said that Koraput being a homogenous district should not be disturbed. This is quote appreciated. But on same grounds we demanded some more police-stations to be added to Koraput. Why this was rejected instead of being considered from that standpoint. If a man goes through Sujankot jungles it will take him 3 days to reach Chintapali. Rice is not grown extensively at Chintapli. They purchase paddy that comes to Padwa hat from Nandapur areas in Orissa. Now in view of the works done at Duduma, All those areas including the offices and institutions should be handed over to Orissa. Instead of doing this, on what geographical considerations the Commission thought it proper to keep Chintapali with Andhra, from where it takes 3 days for a man to reach. This is a matter of regret. Shri Mahtab, before he came to power in Government had once challenged to face an election on this issue. Those who challenged him in a Berhampur meeting, are now fortunately in high positions. These people now say that they had higher responsibility to discharge when the issue was being discussed. In reply to the same issue they now say that the Andhra Government have already invested such a huge amount on the Duduma works and how can Sujanpur come to us. The Government of Orissa have permitted the Central Government for the location of a steel plant at Rourkela. If similarly Duduma is kept within Orissa then there will be no difficulty in execution of the work which is now being done by the Co-operation of the Orissa and Andhra Governments. Will the Oriyas object to it ? Will the work of Duduma be stopped ? Will Duduma cease to produce electricity if it is located in Orissa ? Will not the Andhras take electricity ? All these arguments indicate our weakness. If we do not remove this weakness, we will not in inefficiency. We must strongly put forth our claims. Let the Central Government accept our memorandum, our reasonable arguments or let them be prepared to face the revolution that will otherwise come. We always say that we are having a democratic administration, we are the representatives of the people and we are reflecting whsies of the people. The people when excited could burn the report and does it not reflect the opinion of the public ? Why should we not respect the opinion of the people in a democractic set up. We will put forth before the Central Government that this is the Government of the people and that this is our public opinion and there should be no attempts to suppress this public opinion. I am informed that attempts were made to stop trains at Mayurbhanj. I can understand if the Government sent the Police to drive away the people and allow the train to pass but I am unable to see any reason, why the District President, Mayurbhanj Congress, made attempts to pacify the mob. Shri Biswanath Das gave a statement that it is a blunder to set fire to the report. Does not amount to the suppression of public opinion ? His ownimage would have been set to fire if he would have told them this before the report was burnt. Why should we neglect public opinon ? We must strongly put forth the public opinion before the Central Government. If they do not pay any heed to our reasonable arguments, in that case we must think about our future line of action. It will give expression to our weakness if we stick to a minimum demand instead of demanding what has been asked for in the memorandum submitted by Government and other institutions.

Shri GANGADHAR PAIKRAY : Hon'ble the Speaker, Sir, different political parties, within this House, as well as outside, have recorded their protest against the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission in separate resolutions. But who is responsible for not affording us an opportunity to put forth our claims unitedly ? Orissa would have been able to get her demands fulfilled if the Central Government would have given clear instructions on fixed principles to the persons entrusted to do this job. The leaders of our country, the persons who are now at the helm of affairs and also those who have given evidence before the Commission, spread a rumour that Singhbhum Sadar and Seraikela-Kharaswan will merge in Orissa. But finding no trace of this in the Report, the one and half crore people of Orissa have been disappointed and have set fire to the Report or have otherwise demonstrated their protests. The friends of Shri Madhusudan Das and Pandit Shri Gopabandhu who are the founders of Utkal Sammelani and who initiated the agitation for amalgamation of Oriya-speaking areas could not take the leadership in this matter. The British Government in order to suppress the Oriyas kept them divided in different provinces. In the year 1803 the British Government conquered Orissa and in 1817 brought Khurda under their control. I belong to the area where the Paik revolution of Khurda took place. After this revolution, the British Government paralysed the people of Orissa by dividing them into administrations. You will see, Sir that in order to suppress the interests of Orissa they have kept only one railway line Madras Calcutta in this State which compare very poorly against other provinces. There can be no divided opinion that Orissa has been neglected in all these respects. Those who took the leadership in the agitation against the British Government are now in charge of the administration of the State. Their doctrine is truth and non-violence. The agitation, which continued for the last 50 years for amalgamation of Oriya-speaking tracts would have been fulfilled if the States had been formed on linguistic basis. Mr. Speaker, Sir., If we go through the speeches delivered by the leaders of various political parties of Orissa on public paltforms, it will be evident that 1 1/2 crores of the people of the whole of Orissa agree on this point. Why so much of tug-of-war ? Why was it not placed before the Union Government or the Commission ? Would it not have been very reasonable ? It has been done at various places. In this State for the abolition of Feudatory States, democratic agitations were started in various places, the leadership being taken by many Hon'ble Members of this House. You must be knowing that late Shri Madhusudan Das, who is so to say the pride of Orissa, was a man living in European style but his heart was crying for the cause of the State and the Nation. Though he and the late Pandit Gopabandhu Das differed in many respects, they could combine when it affected the cause of the State and the Nation. But it give much pain to see today that the leaders of Orissa could not be united when the question of re-adjustment of our boundries came up.

It is a matter of great regret and shame that our leaders could not lay their claims unitedly. The Late Madhusudan Das, the late Gopabandhu Das and late Niranjan Patnaik carried on the agitation for creation of a separate Orissa Province. Now all the dreams of those who planned this agitation will vanish into airy nothing. I request all the parties to walk hand in hand. The Congress have the reins of Government in their hand in Bihar, in Orissa and in Andhra. You know that in the international field and among the various countries of the world, great changes are being introduced on mutual discussions and on the principles of Panchsila. If great changes are possible on mutual understanding among the different nations of world where lies the difficulty to solve such small problems on mutual understanding with Bihar, Madhya Pradesh or Andhra ? You know that some nations have adopted imperialistic principles and others the principle of communism but all the same many great problems are being solved by mutual understanding. But I fail to understand why the formation of province on linguistic basis could not be possible in our case. Our leaders carried on the agitation for greater Utkal. They felt it and agitated for Sareikela subdivision and Sadr subdivision of Singhbhum, but why this could not be solved till now ? I would most respectfully ask the Leaders of the House if he has any apprehension regarding this problems. The Congress are in change of the administration in India, they fought for the independence of India and the Government is now running under the leadership of the Congress; was it not possible for them to hold a conference and submit their agreed proposals

to the Commission and request them to decide everything according to this principle ? Why did they not do that ? Those who courted the jails and received bullet wounds while fighting against imperialism, are now afraid to ask Shri Krishna Sinha and decide the matter amicably. If they could have done that, the friendship between Bihar and Orissa would have remained in tact and yet the claims of Orissa would have been recognised. But nothing has been done in this respect until now. That is why the people are of opinion that our leaders have some soft corner for Bihar. As I have said already Bihar Government is to strong for the Government of Orissa to accede to demand of Orissa through a Conference. Perhaps you are aware that the Orissa Government did not agitate and endeavour as was required of them. You may kindly recollect that in this House in April last while discussing about Seraikela and Kharaswan I declared unto the House that in the year 1953, the Communist Party of Bihar were the only political group which admitted that Sereikala and Kharaswan and Sadar subdivison of Singhbhum are predominantly Oriya-speaking areas and the Ho tribe there were in majority and have cultural affinity with Orissa. When I said this, I distinctly remember that the Chief Minister asked me as to what is the number of the Communist Party in Bihar Legislative Assembly. I believe the Chief Minister remembers the occasion.

If there had been friendly discussions between the Governments of Bihar and Orissa regarding the dispute in accordance with the policy followed by the Communist Party, then such undesirable incidents, as on the 18th October, 1955 would not have taken place. Again there are some politcal parties, who are of opinion that when the just claims of Orissa had not been considered, it should be reduced to an appreciable minimum. This is an everyday affair in Muffsil market where dealers in cloth always raise the price by two rupees more than the actual cost and the customer higgles for reasonable price by reducing two rupees. That type of higgling is now going on in Orissa. Some people are putting forth their actual demand, no matter whether it is acceded to or not. But those who are wise, in view of the approaching election, clamour for only the outlying tracts, no matter whether they are predominantly Oriya-speaking areas and whether there exists geographical contiguity, cultural affinity or administrative convenience. It is the same with the opposing parties. Neither it will solve our problem nor it will give us justice.

We hear that propaganda is now going on regarding States Reorganisation. The Congress Working Committee have appointed a high power sub-committee consisting of four members. Our Provincial Congress leadersare running to this high power sub-committee very often. It is evident from their reactions that they have claimed for 20 acres, and expect that at least 10 of them will come to Orissa. If this much is acceded to they hope that they would be able to meet the criticism of the Opposition and further they apprehend that if this is not acceded to they may not be able to be returned in the next general election. The Congress Working Committee is saying that everything depends on the decisions that the Parliament would take in this regard. These are some of the rumours which are now on the wings. The Communist Party in Bihar, though a small Party, is acting on a certain principle. They have given their clear opinion: Of course, our Orissa Communist Party have sent Shri Govind Chandra Mohanty and Shri Ram Krushna Pati to Andhra to open discussions regarding the disputed areas with the Andhra Communist leaders. We should sink our differences so far as our party ideology is concerned and put forth our claims unitedly and unanimously. We hear that Utkalmani late Gopabandhu Das and Madhusudan Das differed in their opinion in respect of all matters except when it was a question of amalgamation of outlying tracts ; on this issue they always came together and identified themselves with each other sinking all their differences. Likewise, irrespective of our party ideologies we should place our claims before the Indian Government, not only in this House but also in all public meetings. We should place the demands of our one and half crore people, how, Seraikela subdivision, Sadar subdivision of Singhbhum, the Bastar area of Madhya Pradesh and the Zamindari areas of Phuljhar will come buck to Orissa. We have also our claims regarding southern outlying areas. In my opinion it would be better to decide the fate of disputed areas through friendly discussions between sister States. Really the States Reorganisation Commission have done great injustice to us. From the point of view of the welfare of the whole of the Indian Union, the Commission have no doubt given some good suggestions. They have suggested to do away with Rajpramukhas and Part C States for all time to come. It is a progressive suggestion. Russia is the only country in the whole world who has solved the problem of reorganising the States on linguistic basis. We have to learn it from Russia. The Commission alone should not be blamed for their failure to reorganise the States. The Central Government have the greatest responsibility in regard to it. The Congress though the majority group should carry with them all the other political parties in regard to this issue. At last I would request you and the Finance Minister that our responsibility does not cease only by sending 40 copies of the debate on States Reorganisation Commission Report. A copy of the proceedings should be sent to each member of the Lok Sabha and the Council of States who represent Orissa. Again I would request the Congress Party, who are now at the helm of affairs of the State, to enlist the support of the other political parties in placing before the Central Government a strong claim for the amalgamation of outlying Oriya-speaking tracts.

Shri NILAKANTHA DAS : Mr. Speakder, Sir, you will have to excuse me, for I may perhaps be a little unpleasant on this occasion, as I shall have to speak from experience from my very childhood. That experience moreover is at times bitter. It has been said in Shri Bijoy Kumar Pani's amendment that in first three items the Commission have done good things. First, it provides safeguards for linguistic minority; secondly, they have proposed the abolition of Rajpramukhs and thirdly, there is a proposal to abolish also the Class C State. For these three things thanks to the Commission. But such thanks with appreciation is a mere convention. One who does good gets thanks but these good things are nothing extraordinary. These are very common things. Had I been appointed as the Commission, I could have done many things of this nature. Any man could have said whether such things will be done or not, but what real work has the Commission done ?

I am put in mind of a story in this connection. A missionary had beard. Somebody gave him a ripe jack-fruit. He did not know what jack-fruit is. He opened the fruit and put his mouth into it to eat. Consequently, the sticky substance of jack-fruit stuck to his beard. He closed his doors and began to clean the beard of that sticky substance, but he could not. His chin and cheek became very painful. Lastly somebody came and told him to shave out the beard as the only remedy. It seems to me, by setting up this Commission our bearded India Government has likewise eaten a jack-fruit. Then why are they cleaning the beard like this ? Let them shave out the beard. That is, in other words, let them scrap the Report and think of another Commission. This Commission has not done things to deserve so much discussion and argument. Ex-State areas became merged in the Union and that made it 'ip so facto' possible to create some new States. For instance, Visalandhra State would not have been possible as the Telengana was in Hyderabad. Now the way is clear of itself. So long as Travancore and Cochin were Indian States, how could Kerala be proposed ? Similarly Mysore made the State of Karnatak possible. What was left for the Commission to do in proposing these States ? Their real duty was to form linguistic States and to consider other things in that connection.

I admit the Members of the Commission command Scholarship, they have experience of service to the people as well as they are capable of dealing out justice. But in what manner has the term 'linguistic' been applied here in this connection ? What special knowledge they have exhibited in the matter of linguistic distribution ? I find nothing to note that they command such knowledge. Incidentally it may however be observed here that to keep the Tata Company in Bihar they have brought out a wonderful economic argument. That argument is that if the Company goes to Orissa or to any other State Bihar itself will become an agricultural State. What kind of argument is this ? Well, I am presently coming to this. Let us now come to the distribution of land according to its language. Many might not have known that the Hindi language which is now the language of Schools and Courts in Bihar is not the real language of that State. The State of Bihar is not at all Hindi-speaking. From the Hazaribag Jail to the homes of lawyers and advocates in Patna, nowhere people talk Hindi among themselves. The real languages of Bihar are Maghi, Bhojpuri and Maithili. Up to the 15th Century, somehow Maithili developed some literature. No literature could grow in Maghi and Bhojpuri. During the Moghal time the Latas or Kayasthas of Meerut came to Bihar as intermediary rulers and settled in that land. They brought with them the Meerut Hindi of those times that is Urdu. That Urdu called Kayathi language with a script

of the same name, was the fashionable language of the ruling class or the upper few of Bihar. Seeing these bad state of affairs in Bihar, the then School Inspector of the Lower Provinces. i. e., Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Chotanagpur, Bhudeb Chandra Mukhopadhyaya introduced that Urdu in the name of Hindi but with Devnagari script in the Education Department of Bihar. That language has in course of time become the present Hindi of Bihar. This Hindi of Bihar is not the language of Bihar, nor, is it like any language of any land near Bihar. It is western Hindi, i, e., like the Hindi of regions near about Delhi. The noun or verbal gender variation in this Hindi is very wonderful. Again the passive use of this Hindi with suffix name is very difficult to learn for people not used to it. It is for this reason that scholars decide and say that this Hindi has come out of the language of another set of Vedic Aryans who came and settled in India in later times. When Sanskrit gradually tended to merge into Prakirt and thus became corrupt. Aryans of north-western India began to use the Sanskrit of Panini and other grammarians as the national language of the Aryans. Gradually, verbs of ten tenses or 'ଲ' କାର became simplified into verbs made by 'କୃତ୍ୟ' and 'ନିଷ୍ଠା ପ୍ରତ୍ୟୟ' as for instance man said "ଅହଂ ଗତଃ *Aham Gata*", woman said "ଅହଂ ଗତା *Aham Gata*". Similarly "ମୟା ଗ୍ରନ୍ଥଃ ପଠିତଃ *Maya Grantha Pathita*", "ମୟା ପୁସ୍ତିକା ପଠିତା *Maya Pustrka Pathita*". This "ତ *Ta*" suffix is "ଲ *La*" in present Oriya. Here is to origin of the use of the verbal gender variation in Hindi. Similary, "ମୟା ଗମ୍ୟତେ, ସ୍ଥିୟତେ, କଥ୍ୟତେ *Maya Gamyate*, *Sthiyate*, *Kathyate*" and such other passive use is responsible for the use in Hindi of the suffix "ନେ *Ne*" This was the characteristic of the language near about Delhi from where Mahammedans in those days took it up and developed their 'Urdu'. The very fashionable Muslim ruling class again developed from this Urdu, the noun and verbal gender variations is several ways. In the present fashionable Hindi, therefore, if 'ବାଳ' (Hair) is masculine, "ମୋଁଛ" (mustache) is feminine. If 'ନାକ' (nose) is masculine 'ଆଁଖ' (eye) is feminine and so on. There is no law for such use either a grammatical or otherwise. Only that man who knows it, knows it. Otherwise, it must be learnt from the mouth of the Hindi Teacher.

The Biharis are making this Hindi their own. In this they are like new converts and therefore fanatics like Kalapahad. This fundamental aspect of the question should be remembered when one goes to organise States in India. It was after much thought and deliberation that 'Hindi' based on Sanskrit or free and easily intelligible Hindi language has been decided to be our National Language but it is on account of this fanaticism that this Hindi is not liked by Hindi-speaking people like Biharis but such Sanskritic Hindi is in a sense unbearable to them.

I have said that the real language or the peoples' language of Bihar is Maghi, Maithili or Bhojpuri. In this distribution roughly speaking, Maghi is towards Oriya, Maithili is towards Bengali and Bhojpuri is towards Banarasi. Therefore in Chotanagpur which is never Bihar, towards the north, i. e.., towards Gaya side is Maghi. South Chotanagpur or Singhbhum and southern Ranchi is Oriya and eastern Chotanagpur is Bengali. Has the Commission understood this ? Again the customs, manners and practices of the Kolhas and other Adibasis of the Oriya region of South Chotanagpur are particularly to be noticed in this connection. Biharis are in no way near them in these matters. Again to stamp the Punjabi-Sikh and Marwari businessmen of Dhalbhum and Singhbhum as Hindi-speaking and therefore count them as Biharis is meaningless in this connection. Rather, things like this are the root of all troubles. Many might have read the books on Kharia, Munda, Birho and other Tribes of Chotanagpur by Shri Sarat Chandra Ray describing the culture and practices of these Kolha and allied Tribes. The Journal 'Man in India' edited by him might also have been read by many. The women of these tribes in their menses remain unclean upto seven days. They bathe in out of the way places. Household fire or earthern pots of household use, they never touch. These practices. we Oriyas, have takent, from them for our customs in the plains even near the coas are practically like theirs. Nowhere else these practices are observed in this manner. Their women just like ours give rice to the crow and observe its manner of eating to read womens as to whether a friend is coming or a bad news is coming, etc. Again just like our women, their women observe the sound of birds and beast, to read whether a man will die or a patient will revive. I remember my mother, interpreting such omens and indications just as you may read in Sarta Chandra Roy's books. I learn also that they performed 'Jantal' (ଜାଁତାଳ) . Santhals call this Jantal (ଜନ୍ତାଳ) . In our villages the barber women worships village goddess for all and Jantal or feast of offerings is performed there after goat is sacrificed. Those tribals perform their Jantal just in the same manner. This custom is not found only in Singhbhum but can be found up to Ranchi. Undoubtedly this is an Oriya custom. In the villages of these tribals, Oriya potter, blacksmith, carpenter, weaver and other artisan castes are living just like their own men. It is not easy to distinguish whose language is Ho and whose is not 'Ho'. Has the States Reorganisation Commission considered these things ? If attention is paid to the language and customs in this manner there is no doubt that the whole of Singhbhum including Dhalbhum will come to Orissa.

Again we are being told to settle our boundary problem in private negotiation with Bihar. Our Government of India also is now telling us this. May be, the Commission put plugs in their ears but does not the Government know how the Biharis sing and threaten in their procession :—

"ଶୁଣରେ ଓଡ଼ିଆ ଶୁଣରେ ବଙ୍ଗାଳୀ
ବିହାରକା ଯୌବାଇ
ମଜଫରପୁରକା ଲଠି ମୁଙ୍ଗେର କା ବରଛା
ପାଟନା କା ତଲବାର।"

(This means—Hear O Oriya, hear O Bungalee
Bihar's only reply
Muzaffarpur Lathi Munghyr's Spear
Patna's Sword will ply)

Only the other day Bihar leaders were bombarding from open platforms, "we shall not give even a square inch of land from Bihar to anyone". Where is argument in this ? Will you make a gift of your land so that others will get ? Then, why was the Commission set up in this independent India ? Then why is there, the impartial Government in the Centre ? Have such things been said anywhere else in India ? We are always in fear of the Biharis. Now the position is not different. If it is not that, will anyone tell us, what other agruments Bihar has ?

Bihar's only argument is as the proverb says "Father's wealth got by robbery becomes son's paternal property" ? When we have robbed it somehow we should not part with it. In case of Seraikela and Kharaswan, the application of this argument is fresh in every one's memory. Till the other day these two ex-State areas were Oriya and nothing but Oriya. How Bihar got it, is well known. Today, Bihar is so keen to claim that it is Bihar land. The claim is astounding if not absurd and requires no examination.

Apart from this, the Commission ought to have looked into the History of at least 40 to 50 years. Terms of reference require it. Mr. Panikar is known to be an historian. What history did he look into ? The name of Chotanagpur was originally south-western Agency. These lands were acquired by the British Government by detached incidents of annexation and were put together under a common name, of South-Western Agency. Sambalpur, Surguja, Jashpur were included in this Agency. Somehow Sambalpur was given to us. The remaining tracts had been named Chotanagpur after Nagpur which was near it. Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Chotanagpur were put together and became one province, called Lower provinces of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Chotanagpur. From it Assam had already been separated.' In 1905, to crush the political influence of Bengalees this Lower provinces were divided into two according to the proposal of Lord Curzon. It was meant practically to divide Bengal into two provinces; East and West Bengal, which included Bihar, Orissa and Chotanagpur. Bengalees did not brook this Division and Bombay, Punjab and Madras practically were then in great sympathy with Bengal. The British were watching popular opinion. In 1911, unfortunately for us and fortunately for Bihar, Sir Ali Iman, the famous Bihari Barrister was Governor-General's Executive Councilor in Calcutta. Under his advice, when division of Bengal had to be annulled, another trick was played. It was the creation of Bihar and Orissa as a separate Province. To attach Orissa to Bihar, a strange argument was adduced. It was to give a Sea Board to "Bihar", as if Bihar had to to be provided with Maritime trade or other maritime activities. But the effect of it was that Chotanagpur had to be put in the new province of Bihar and Orissa as a geographical necessity, for otherwise, Bihar could not be contiguous to Orissa. We had definitely begun demanding the district of Singhbhum including Dhalbhum as Oriya land since 1903

in our Utkal Sammilani. Singhbhum now remained part of Bihar and Orissa and we did not then know that it was part of a scheme to ultimately include it in Bihar.

Then came to the O' Donnell Committee. At the time, there was no other organisation in Orissa except the Utkal Sammilani but when we all had by that time joined the Congress the prestige and effectiveness of the Sammilani was rather downed. I was selected the sole representative by the Utkal Provincial Congress Committee to submit memorandum to the O' Donnell Committee and give evidence before it. I submitted a printed memorandum and had to give evidence before the Committee on January 10th, 1932 at Jamshedpur where I had reached on the 8th but the same day I got a telegram telling me that the O'Donnell Committee should be boycotted by the Congress under the instuctions of the High Command. I returned the same day to Puri but my friend the late Sachidananda Singh of Bihar was there with the Committee to represent the interests of Bihar. It may be incidentally mentioned here that in spite of the Congress mandate to boycott the Committee, even prominent Congress men like Pattavi Sitaramayya and the late Nageswar Rao had somehow managed to give evidence before the Committee to fight their cause against Orissa. It may, however, further be mentioned in this connection that Shri Pattavi Sitaramayya himself was the Secretary of a Committee set up under my presidentship in December 1928 at Calcutta during the session of the Indian National Congress there to agitate as solid block for linguistic Provinces in India. It goes with out saying moreover that there was none in Orissa to match the late Sachidananda Singh of Bihar in prestige, postion and influence. Whatever be the recommendation of the O'Donnell Committee, it was never based on any effective evidence from Orissa side and the want of contiguity on account of the intervening Indian States was the main. if not the only, reason to reject Orissa's claim so far as Singhbhum is concerned, though long before the time the district of Sambalpur which was much more distant and detached had been included in the Orissa Division of Bihar and Orissa.

In 1936, the Orissa Province was formed out of Bihar and Orissa by an Order-in-Council. In this new province naturally the Orissa Division of Bihar and Orissa was included. Now even after Mayurbhanja has been merged in Orissa, the States Reorganisation Commission has though it proper to fling in our fact that Order-in-Council based on the findings of that O'Donnell Committee. They have clearly forgotten the fact how the entire Chotanagpur was included in Bihar though Biharis have no claim to it either linguistically or otherwise. Moreover, the nearerness of Chaibasa to Patna has been put forward as an argument on the point whereas the fact is that Chaibasa, which is 300 miles from Patna, is only 130 miles to Cuttack.

We had never seriously questioned the Biharis as to whose land the Chotanagpur is, for the situation was so unconducive. We have all along been feeling our way in fear of the Biharis. It is needless to expartiate upon this with arguments and illustrations. Let me narrate only one typical instance. On the 8th February 1927 in the then Central Assembly, I moved a resolution demanding all Oriya speaking lands to be put in one separate province. At that time Shri Bhubananda Das, who had been elected from the same constituency as mine, moved an amendment demanding only the amalgamation of all the Oriya speaking lands to put into the Province of Bihar. Privately he argued with me that a demand for the separate province will alienate Bihar and we may lose more than we expect to gain. But I did not agree with him and both the resolution as well as the amendament were moved. The result was that the Bihar and Orissa Government took full advantage of it in the memorandum they submitted before the Simon Commission. They said Orissa with Puri, Cuttack, Balasore and Sambalpur is one constituency in the Central Assembly. Two members have been elected from that constituency. One of them demands a separate province for Oriya -speaking lands, the other speaks for amalgamation of Oriya-speaking lands and to keep the amalgamated area in Bihar and Orissa. Therefore it is not clear as to what the Oriya people's definite opinion is. This is a part of our history. We had not the courage to express that we wanted a separate province of our own. In one of my platform speeches I said in those days "If Oriya-speaking lands are not made into a separate province why should Ganjam come to Orissa which is merely a division in Bihar ? In Madras Presidency the expenditure per head is 4 1/2 annas whereas in Bihar it is only seven pice. If the sentiment that it is our province is not roused then why should Ganjamies come to Orissa ? If one brother falls into mire, another borther tries to raise him up. He does not himself fall into the same mire because his brother has already fallen into it." This state of mind, it was feared by many, might alienate Bihar. Under the circumstances before any decision is given by the Commission, the historical background should have been investigated. The Commission should have cross-examined Bihari witnesses on these points. I am sure they could have said nothing. Now even after the Report has been published they have no argument to put forward for claiming the district of Singhbhum.

But there is one thing and that is the crux of the problem. It is Jamshedpur and for this Jamshedpur the entire Dhalbhum with it. I am not considering here whether it will go to Bengal or Orissa. This is not the place to consider that question, but let us examine Bihari's claim. Bihar has already swallowed the entire Chotanagpur which is not its own land. Yet this Dhalbhum jutting down to the south between Midnapur and Mayurbhanj like a tail, would be not only uncouth but rather a geographical incongruity. Without considering all this, now the proposal is in the air to give a corridor to Bihar to reach Dhalbhum, on account of its Jamshedpur.

Now I shall tell you the story of Jamshedpur. Before 1907 Jamshedjee Tata was in search of a suitable place for an Indian Iron and Steel Company in India. For this purpose he spent about Rs.7,00,000 on foreign experts who looked for a place throughout India but failed. That was the time of the Swadesi movement of Bengal. Before this Mr P. N. Bose was appointed the State Geologist by the then Maharaja of Mayurbhanj, Shri Ram Chandra Bhanja Deo. This P.N. Bose after a geological survey of the State came to the conclusion that Gorumahisani contained enermous quantities of good iron-ore which would be commercially successful. Shri Ram Chandra Bhanja Deo pointed this out to Jamsheddjee Tata who again brought experts from Europe and found Bose's report to be correct. It was decided to set up the factory somewhere in Mayurbhanj but the problem arose whether it would be so done in face of the Political department which may create difficulties at any time. Hence the nearest convenient place was selected. It was Kalimati Railway station in Dhalbhum within easy access of Gorumahisani. You will be surprised Sir, to learn, it has been recorded by Mr. Fraser in his life of Jamshedjee Tata, that in 1907, on the day on which the shares of the Tata Company were to be collected, all the shares were sold on the same day before evening. Even women of Bombay sold their oranaments to purchase shares. The real impetus and motive force on this occasion came from the Swadesi movement of Bengal. Thus the national spirit which rose from Bengal and the cleverness and clear vision of the Maharaja of Mayurbhanj were the basic element on which the present Tata Company has raised its head. Bihar has contributed neither money nor action nor spirit. Bihar has neither spent anything nor has taken any trouble for it. But Bihar has got one thing in this connection. It is the hawk-like covetous eye of Biharies on Jamshedpur. Hence it is that when Bihar and Orissa were put together in one province, the question of giving us Jamshedpur was not raised. What was our condition then, nobody will perhaps understand now. Let me tell you one thing which may give you some inkling about it Mr. Fakruddin was the Education Minister of Bihar and Orissa. It is under his instructions that a separate department for teaching of Urdu was opened in the training school of Cuttack. If sufficient notice is not taken of these conditions, then our problems will not be solved.

The Government of India should divert their attention to another point. The Commission has heard about it but they have behaved as if they have not heard it at all. What right, has Bihar to collect Adibasis to keep them in their own State ? In this has Bihar any history or any social aptitude ? On the other hand Oriyas have a unique tradition of absorbing Adibasis and making them their own.

No other people in India have got this tradition or aptitude. It must be observed that on one side this problem has created Eastern Pakistan as the Adibasis there could not be naturalised. On the other side i.e. in the south till the other day the Adibasis were standing at a distance of 60 cubits even in law courts. But in Orissa there is no trace of such tradition or customs. We are Brahmins of Puri and are the highest Brahmins of Orissa. Sauras, Bauris and Kandaras are Adibasis and Harijans. As our labourers they freely enter our house, keep grain in our granary and take it out whenever necessary. Our God is Jagannath, before whom there is no distinction traditionally between a Pandit and a Palia. As is well known, he is primarily, the God of the Adibasis. Even

today Daitas who are originally Saoras are Jagannath's Kinsmen—sebaks. These Daitas are in no way socially inferior to the highest Brahmin. At Jagannathpur near Ranchi even now car-festival is performed, year after year. Adibasis i.e., tribals more than a lakh join that festival. If any impartial Judge or Commission notice it even once, he will not even include Ranchi in Bihar, not to speak of Singhbhum or Dhalbhum.

Another strange argument which I have already referred to is if Jamshedpur goes out, Bihar will become an agricultural State. Will heavens come down, if Bihar becomes an agricultural State ? Uttar Pradesh is an agricultural State. What calamity has fallen on Uttar Pradesh and India for that matter ? Does not agriculture also mean industry ? There is sugar industry. Some of it are in Uttar Pradesh. The rest of it are in Bihar. Is it unknown how in the name of protection of this sugar industry Indians are paying many crores of rupees every year as indirect tax and thus have made the industry prosperous and stable ? Besides this Bihar has the fertiliser factory at Sindhri, the big cement factory of Dalmia and many other factories already existing or sure to come into being. What argument is it to say that it will become an agricultural State ? It is only a device to protect and patronise the interests of Bihar at the expense of Oriyas and Bengalees. As such it is a very dangrous performance. In arguments and decisions like this our national problems will be rather more complicated instead of being solved. This, to prove, requires no argument. Before 1936, I was elected to the Central Assembly from a constituency in Bihar and Orissa. At this time Orissa was separated. Many friends staunted me at Jamshedpur "Now Orissa has been separated. Why are yo still coming to Jamshedpur ?" All those friends were Biharis. There is reason for such remarks. Just after the separation Bihar Government began a new performance there. Officers were appointed to collect labourers in parade every week to ascertain how many of them are Biharis, how many Oriyas and how many Telugus, etc., Perhaps as a result of this parade and counting Oriya employees whose number was then about 8,000 have been reduced in number to about 1,600. This parade and this counting was in vogue till the other day. I am told there are secret circulars to recruit Biharis as far as possible in all vacant and new posts. In spite of all these activities the same Biharis are vorciferous in the outside world in their statement that they want all matters should be considered from the view point of non-provincial-Indian-nationalism. But what non-provincial nationalism it is to grab Jamshedpur in this manner for this purpose ? Is it an instance of protectingi the minorities as many in Bihar may content ? Look at this minority protection in the matter of language. Oriya though I am in the matter of language I am never parochial or even provincial as such. Only four days ago I gave evidence before Official Language Commission. I told them in clear terms that all regional languages should be written in Devanagari script alone. This Devanagari script should be all-India script. In that connection I also told them that if the intention is that Hindi will remain as our national language, then all necessary new and translatee words should be coined strictly according to Sanskrit etymology or otherwise foreign or regional words or expressions, already used intelligibly almost throughout India should remain as it is. The gender variation in noun and verb should be entirely abolished. Will these things be at all understood by Hindi fanatics of Bihar ? You will be surprised Sir, to learn that recently in Singhbhum and Seraikela on letter-boxes is written *Patra Ghushel* "ପତ୍ର ଘୁଷେଲ" and not "ଚିଠି ବାକ୍ସ," *Chithi Baksa* Attempts to introduce Hindi like this among the minorities will rather create aversion towards Hindi. Let the Government consider whether in this kind of linguistic activities our Indian nationalism will grow or decay. If nationalists like these Biharis be given indulgence, in land grabbing our nationalism will daily face fresh problems.

Many do not understand the real secret as to why States should be divided according to their language. On any account Jamshedpur is to be kept in Bihar. For this any argument should be produced. If Dhalbhum goes either to Orissa or to Bengal then surely blunder will enter into the conception of great India or India as a Union. These arguments are either dispassionate nor impartial.

Orissa began this principle of division of India into linguistic tracts or provinces. Our late Mr. M. S. Das wanted to introduce this principle in Indian National Congress even at a date as far back as 1902. Unfortunately, on this issue he had to leave the Congress as Congress then could not understand the principle of lingulstic division. Since then Orissa was agitating for it under the guidance of the Utkal Sammilani. At last Mahatma Gandhi came to the Congress in 1920. Immediately, he divided India into provinces strictly on the basis of language. He gave us the State of Bastar and the entire district of Singhbhum including Dhalbhum. The name Utkal was given by him. It is really painfull to tell you Sir, about the machination for land grabbing which came after that. I have not also the mind to wash our dirty linen here on this platform. It was in 1933 or 1934. I was then the President of the Utkal Congress. One fine morning suddenly, I found that Dhalbhum was taken from Orissai to Bihar. We wrote letters, demanded the why and the how of it, gave reminder after reminder but there was no reply. Niranjan Patnaik is not in the land of the living. Had he been here all reliable informations could have been obtained from his file. I still remember what also happened previously in 1921. To decide on the claims of Bihar upon Singhbhum including Dhalbhum a Committee was set up by the Indian National Congress. Both Rajendra Babu and Pandit Gopabandhu Das were members of the Committee. They decided to take plebiscite in Singhbhum including Dhalbhum by taking votes of /the Congressmen of the Province. Four thousand reply post cards were issued to the Congress members for the purpose. In reply more than three thousand gave their votes in favour of Orissa and only about 400 in favour of Bihar. Now grounds on which the Biharis demand to keep Singhbhum including Dhalbhum in Bihar are perhaps beyond the comprehension of ordinary men like us.

Shri Fazal Ali, the Chairman of the Commission is a gentleman who is expected to weigh evidence and give his verdict. He got the place as the Chairman as he is known to be a man well-versed in dealing out justice. Others may speak from various aspects but he is to look at the thing dispassionately. Now the subject of the boundaries between the State of Bihar on one side and of Orissa and Bengal on the other, is one of the most controversial matters. On such a matter he has said "on account of my long association with Bihar, I shall not touch the subject even with a pair of tongues In other words I know that a great injustice may have to be done for reasons beyond my control but I shall not be a party to it."

Under such circumstances how the decision of the other two gentlemen on the subject of the boundaries of Bihar should be binding, is more than I can say. The Government of India ought to fix their attention on tl is very reievant aspect of the question, and they should, if need be, set up another Commission for the delimitation of boundaries between Bihar and Orissa as well as between Bihar and Bengal to give them proper and right advice with clear and definite terms of references in which there will be no loop-hole to mince matters.

I am discuss the question from many other aspects but in face of what my friends have already said and particularly of Government memoranda, I have no desire to say any thing more, I say, if we are to give up something in order that we may get something, we should ungrudgingly give it. Of course it is a sign of weakness. I particularly refer to the corridor which our Congress and perhaps our Government are ready to give to get a portion of Sadar Singhbhum and Seraikela. Of course it is not what we ought to do but what other way is left to us. Uttar Pradesh has no industry. There fore, if a proposal is forced on us to give Rourkela to Utter Pradesh with a long corridor upto that State, then I am afraid we have perhaps not the courage to say 'no'.

We have always remained practically in this condition. We had no province of our own, others had had theirs. In this matter we may be well-compared to a posthmous child born after the division of the paternal property among other bothers. Such a child after he grows up, goes from door to door and from court to court to secure his share slices of property from other brothers. Our case is not in any way different. Before our province was formed, our lands had been grabbled by neighbours. We came to the field long after the event. We have knocked many doors. We have lost the case in the States Reorganisation Commission. Now everything depends on the Government of India. There at long last we still expect justice.

I have said so much on Bihar. Now a word on Madhya Pradesh where the circumstances are not much different. It will be practically a repetition. Bastar and Chhatisgarh is not Hindi -speaking just as Bihar is not Hindi-speaking.

The Laria language of those tracts as well as Bastari or Bhattari and Halbi languages are much like Oriya. In Kalahandi, Jeypore, Khadial, Bargarh and other similar regions the language is not much different from Chhatisgarhi orBhattari used in regions contiguous to Orissa. I have said how a parochial prakrit in high flown "Apamvransa" from is being

forced in Singhbhum by Bihar converts. I have instanced "ପତ୍ର ଘୁଷେଲ" for letter box. Look at the same tendency in Madhya Pradesh. These Pandits are out to translate English words and expressions into Hindi. Neck-tie is an English expression for which "ଗଳବନ୍ଧ" Galabandha is used in many parts of India. It is quite intelligible even in Madhya Pradesh and Maharastra. But the neo-Hindi worshippers are rendering it "କଣ୍ଠଲେଙ୍ଗଟ" Kanthalengat. The word "ଲେଙ୍ଗଟ" Lengat has come out from the word "ଲିଙ୍ଗାବଗୁଣ୍ଠନ" Lingabagunthana, meaning covering for the Linga "ଲିଙ୍ଗ". To apply it to "କଣ୍ଠ" Kantha or neck may be good Khadiboli Prakrit. In the study and application of Prakrit phonetics, it may have some value but conceptions and actions like this undoubtedly create great trouble in the buiding up of our nation. Biharis on this side and Kosalis on the other, both are new converts and fanatics in this field. I may once again, emphasise that if they get indulgence in this fashion Indian nationalism will be weaker and weaker in spite of innumerable safeguards for the minorities provided in the Constitution. Therefore tracts and regions linguistically associated should be integrated into different States.

With this much, I wait for the impartial justice of the Government of India.

Mr. SPEAKER : How much time the Government will take for its reply.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister) : At least one and half hours.

Mr. SPEAKER : The Government will give its reply after two more members speak for five minutes each.

Shri SONARAM SOREN (Minister) : Mr. Speaker Sir, it is agreed to by all parties that the to-day's discussions in this House are of great importance and all must agree that it is a question of life or death; whether to be or not to be is the question. oI have a lot to say. Members representing various shades of opinion have discussed it from different angles. I have not many new things to add and I also do not desire to waste much time of the House.

All in this House have agreed that the S. R. C. were quite unjust and inconsiderate to Orissa while submitting their Report. The case of Orissa is different from that of others. inasmuch as the Adibasis are in great number in this State and in no other States in India the Adibasis are to be found in such number. The total Adibasi population in all States in India will come to 3 crores. Under the British regime the Adibasis were just like birds and beasts in a zoo and they were moving wherever they choose in jungles just like beasts. The Government in power then had no scheme for them. After independence, when the Government was established on adult franchise the Adibasis became conscious and were hopeful of a bright future for them. After going through the Report of the S. R. C., I am convinced that they have acted at some places in contradistinction to the fundamental principles laid down by them in their report and have also gone beyond the said principles at some other places according to convenience. They have not brought in such principles to bear on successes where those are necessary. As for example they have said in paragraph 112:—

"112. While internal adjustments at State level are to be desired, it is imperative to ensure that these do not lead to maladjustments at the inter-State and national level" and again they have stated in sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 112 that "Consistent with national solidarity, provision of full scope for the unhampered growth of the genious of each group of people'.

In the Report these basic principles have been disregarded.

The British Government did not pay any attention towards the Adibasis of Singhbhum until 1833. The Hos were subject to much injustice and oppression for a pretty long period. They revolted in 1833. The British Government prepared a well-thought-out plan to suppress the Hos for ever. This revolt has earned them the nickname of 'Ladka Hos'. As a measure against further revolt the Kolhan area was formed with five Pirhs from Mayurbhanj, four from Sereikela, one from Kharswan and sixteen other Pirhs from Porahat. In this manner they suppressed the Hos. Therefore, we expected that the S. R. C. appointed by the Central Government in an independent India will take these matters into consideration and allow the Adibasis to merge in that State to which they prefer or in respect of which they have the demand, or to include them in such areas with which they have financial relation, cultural affinity, historical necessity geographical contiguity. But the S. R. C. have not paid any attention to any of their wishes. Towards the end of 1931 the Ho population in Bihar excluding Singhbhum was 104 and in 1954 it was 4,520. Considerting the matter from that aspect we will see that the presence of more Adibasis in Singhbhum was not alltogether taken into consideration. The situation was completely different in 1933 and it should not be cited as a precedent. I will then speak something regarding historical facts. Historically the Adibasis have greater relations with Orissa. Shri Arjun Singh, who participated in the Sepoy Mutiny in 1857, got married in the royal family of Mayurbhanj. The last ruler of Porahat also married in the Mayurbhanj Raj family. Further we know that the number of Hos in Singhbhum in 413,703 and the next in number come the Santalis who are 155,684. So it is a fast that Singhbhum is predominantly an Adibasi area and it should not be ignored. Judging the matter from this aspect, the Commission have done great injustice by not recommending the inclusion of Singhbhum in Orissa. In the district of Ranchi, to the north of Singhbhum, their number is only 279 and in Purulia only. 3. Perhaps they are working there as peons or drivers. There are 1,150 Hos working in the mines at Jharia. In the mica mines at Koradama, their number is 236, in Paralamou 377 and their total number comes to 4, 520. If you proceed towards the south of Singhbhum you will come to Mayurbhanj and Keonjhar districts of Orissa. The Ho population in Mayurbhanj is 117, 552, in Keonjhar 75, 650, in Sundargarh 13, 374, in Cuttack 5, 832, in Dhenkanal 3, 627 and even they are found in Puri and Koraput districts. In every district of Orissa the presence of Adibasis can be noticed more or less and the Ho population in Orissa is 220,000. Further I shall say that the Adibasis and the Oriyas of Singhbhum are so intimately inter-related with each other socially and culturally that when we go to any village we see weavers, blacksmiths and potters living side by side with the Adibasis and supplying cloths, earthen pots, etc., to the Adibasis. We also find the same sort of living in each village of Orissa like Singhbhum it is natural to conclude that the village life in Singhbhum and Orissa are almost similar.

Moreover, the S. R. C. have completely lost sight of another important aspect, namely, the economic aspect. The Adibasis have a tendency to proceed towards the south and they have even reached the coastal areas in some parts. The Hos are to be seen in Puri district even and so also it is the case with the Adibasis other than Hos. It is an admitted fact and Lord Jagannath is the diety of the 'Sabaras' and therefore the Adibasi culture and civilization exist in Puri district. Considering all these aspects we find that the Adibasis of Singhbhum have been proceeding towards the south since 1901 and have settled in almost all the districts of Orissa. Their number is negligible in only some districts of Orissa. The only reason that can be assigned for this is that the density of population in Bihar is 512 per square mile as against 244 in Orissa. So the Adibasis carry the conviction that in Orissa, there is enough space for them. The Adibasis are proceeding on from time to time in search of land as they are generally cultivators, and up till now even they are coming in large numbers. As a matter of fact, during my ministership for the last few years not a single day has passed without receiving hundreds of applications from the Adibasis of Singhbhum praying for allotment of land in Orissa for their settlement. Large number of Adibasis have been settling in Orissa and are settling even now. We see that the density of population per square mile in Keonjhar is 183, in Sundargarh 146 and in Mayurbhanj 256. We have enough accommodation for the people coming for settlement in Orissa and also enough cultivable land. In search of cultivable lands there has been exodus of the Adibasis of Singhbhum into Orissa since 1901.

I shall finish my speech dealing with one more point. In 1932 our country was not independent and India was divided then into two parts. namely, British India and Indian India. At that time the western part of Orissa was full of Feudatory States like the States of Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar, etc., which had no connection with the British Orissa. Consequently in 1933, when the O' Donnell Committee came, the Hos of Singhbhum were against inclusion in Orissa mainly on two grounds—want of communication and the geographical position. But in the present set-up we never expected that the three learned Members of the Commission would consider the question just as the story of Rip-Van-Winkle which we read in our school career. Links and what of communications were the grounds on which they based their conclusions and it were applicable to Orissa then as what Orissa was. At that time Orissa was nothing more or less than the districts of Cuttack Puri, Balasore and Sambalpur but at present the same geographical position and the disadvantages of communication do not exist. So the Commission have not done justice to Orissa either from the geographical, historical or any other aspect. They have done injustice not only to the Oriyas but also to

the Adibasis. They have refused to take notice of the magnitude of the problem and decided the fate of Orissa in a few pages saying that "there is no case for subtracting any area from Orissa and there is also no case for adding any territory to it". At least none could expect such a Report in an independent country. The other argument by them was that the Hos were not in favour of merger with Orissa at that time. There were sufficient reasons as to why the Hos did not like to come to Orissa at that time. The situation was something different then and the Administration was otherwise also. Under the pressure of circumstances they had to say like that. If we look into the history of the Hos their homogeneity and solidarity, it will reveal that their only refuge is Orissa, where they can breathe an autmosphere of peace and tranquility. The S. R. C. have therefore been very unjust towards them in this respect. Out of 12 members from Singhbhum in the Bihar Assembly, majority including Siju Hemram and Ankura Ho, are from Ho community and they have submitted memorandum to merge with Orissa. They have also given their clear opinion in this regard on the floor of the Bihar Assembly while taking part in the discussion on the report of the S. R. C. In the circumstances, if the Commission would reopen the arguments recorded by the O'Donnell Committee in 1932 and hold that the Hos desire to remain in Bihar, I should say that they are far from the reality. The argument of 1932 regarding the unwillingness of the Hos to come to Orissa has already been proved to be a fabrication of the mind and far from the truth. Not only those few members of the Bihar Assembly, but the vast populace behind them are anxious for merger with Orissa. Singhbhum is close to the district to which I belong and the Hos of Singhbhum are fully aware of the policy of Shri Jaipal Singh. Of course, I have nothing to say personally against him. His political stand has now been perfectly understood by those who are educated and also by those who are politically awakened and made conscious. They have now learnt that he is an opportunist vacilating to either side according to his self interests. Sixteen years back, he strongly demanded separation of Chotanagpur from Bihar and formation of a separate Jharkhand State, but now he has joined hands with the Government of Bihar leaving aside the claim for Jharkhand, and declares that they will remain in Bihar. Instead of Jharkhand he now claims for greater Bihar. I should, therefore, say emphatically that those who are following him under the illusion of Jharkhand will one day be disillusioned.

Shri GHASIRAM SANDIL : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have got to say something.

Mr. SPEAKER : The Hon'ble Member was absent in the House when his turn came. Thereafter the Hon'ble Member stood up to speak intervening another Hon'ble Member speaking then. As I did not allow this the Hon'ble Member staged a walk-out in protest. A walkout in protest of the ruling from the Chair and a request for special favour from the Chair can never go simultaneously.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Finance Minister) : I am thankful to the Hon'ble Members who have taken part in the discussion on the States Reorganisation Commission's Report for the last two days.

From the speeches of the Members of the Treasury Bench and of the Opposition, it has been the clear feeling of the Assembly that the States Reorganisation Commission have not done proper justice to the claims of Orissa. There is not one Member in this Assembly who has expressed satisfaction over the report. Some have actually become very much upset over it and one has gone out to abuse the Government of Orissa. In this connection the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has criticised the Government of Orissa in very strong terms. The Hon'ble Member from Patrapur has also not lagged behind him in this regard. He has said that the Congress Government have reduced the minimum demand of Orissa and that Orissa's cause has suffered on account of such reduction. The Hon'ble Member from Banpur has accused us that we kept the memorandum submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission on behalf of Government under lock and key and circulated it only two days back. According to him if these materials were available to the Members in time, it would have been possible for them to create popular opinion in the country at large. The Hon'ble Member from Patrapur asserts that Government have no right to make any commitment without consulting the Advisory Committee appointed by the Assembly on the subject. In reply, I would only recall to the memory of the Hon'ble Members an old saying that "public memory is very short". But individual members should not have such short memories. Specially elderly persons like the Hon'ble Members from Banpur and Patrapur, who have been connected with this movement for long time past should not have such short memory. I can assert with all the emphasis at my command that the Committee which was appointed by this Assembly has been consulted at every stage. That committee consists of members from all parties, in the legislature including members from the Opposition, the Janasangha Party, leader of the Praja Socialist Party, the leader of the Communist Party, and members of Congress Party. I will now invite, Sir, your attention and the attention of the Hon'ble Members as to how the memorandum was prepared under the direction of the Committee.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : If the Hon'ble Minister tells us clearly what resolutions the Committee had passed and how the Government have accepted them, it would be of advantage.

Shri NISHAMANI KHUNTIA : After the memorandum was submitted to the S. R. Commission, what further consultation has been made with this Committee ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Finance Minister) : The Committee was constituted on the 8th April 1953. The terms of reference of this Committee were as follows:—

"This Assembly recommends to Government to constitute a Committee consisting of—

(1) Shri Dinabandhu Sahu
(2) Shri Radhanath Rath
(3) Shri Sonaram Sorein
(4) Shri Bijoy Kumar Pani (Convener)
(5) Shri Karunakar Panigrahi
(6) Shri Godavaris Misra
(7) Shri Harihar Misra
(8) Shri Govinda Pradhan
(9) Shri Sailendranarayan Bhanj Deo
(10) Shri Nishamani Khuntia
(11) Shri Pabitramohan Pradhan

to advise the Government on ways and means for the reintegration of the ex-States of Seraikela and Kharswan with Orissa and the amalgamation of other predominantly Oriya and Adibasi areas having cultural and linguistic affinity with Orissa so that necessary steps may be taken by the Government in this regard".

The Hon'ble Member from Banpur has said that the memorandum was kept under lock and key and was given to the Members only two or three days back. As a matter of fact the Hon'ble Member from Banpur got the memorandum as early as the 12th February 1955. The following list will show the dates on which different Members got the memorandum:—

Shri Godavaris Mishra, M.L.A.	..	12th February 1955
Pandit Nilakantha Das, M.L.A	..	10th February 1955
Shri Harihar Mishra, M.L.A.	..	8th February 1955
Shri Nishamani Khuntia, M.L.A	..	8th February 1955
Shri Dinabandhu Sahu, M.L.A.	..	4th February 1955
Shri Bijoy Kumar Pani, M.L.A.	..	3rd February 1955
Dr. Harekrishna Mahtab, M.P.	..	3rd February 1955
Shri Birakishore Ray, M.P.	..	4th February 1955
Shri Biswanath Das, M. P.	..	6th February 1955
Shri Pratap Keshari Deo, M.L.A	..	12th February 1955
The Maharaja of Patna, M. P.	..	6th February 1955

Other M. Ps. and other Members of the Assembly were supplied with the copies of memorandum between the 5th and 7th November 1955. It is, therefore, wrong to suppose that the Government kept the memorandum concealed from the Members. We did not, of course, think it proper to circulate copies of the memorandum among the public. Till now no Government of any other State have circulated their memorandum, because this may lead to various controversies. We have submitted our memorandum according to the conclusions which were arrived at by the Commitee. Those Members who say that the Government kept the memorandum concealed are labouring under a misconception. The Utkal Sammilani, the Ganatantra Parishad, the different District Congress Committees etc. have also submitted their memoranda. Their demands are not very much different from the demands of the Government of Orissa. The Utkal Provincial Congress Committee have clearly stated "We stand by the memorandum submitted by the Government of Orissa". Different individuals had also submitted separate memoranda. There is not much of difference in all these demands. Now of course the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission have greatly mortified us. But even if we feel hurt, we have to criticise them with the utmost courtesy and restraint because we have respect for the personnel and faith in the Commission. For example, when we go up in appeal against the judgement of the High Court to the Supreme Court we do not use disrespectful language against the High Court or impute motives. Similarly, the recommendations of this three-member

Commission are being subjected to review by the Government of India and the Parliament. The Commission were appointed only to advise the Union Government, who are to take decisions. Unfortunately, the Chairman remained silent over issues in which we were involved. The remaining two members have, it seems, not bestowed as much thought over the issue as it deserved. That is why their conclusions regarding Bihar and Orissa have been rather unrealistic. The Union Government and the Parliament will have to consider this aspect of the question very carefully. The Commission have decided the fate of Orissa while discussing the problems of Bihar by some casual remarks. I quote the relevant paragraphs of the Report below:—

"624. The controversies over Sareikela and Kharaswan are comparatively more recent. The Orissa claim to these areas rests mainly on the ground that Oriyas is the largest single language group. The two States, however, have formed part of the Singhbhum district since May 1948, and the historical affinities of the two States with the Porahat Raj in Singhbhum district on the one hand and with the administration which was in charge of Chotanagpur Division on the other, are held to justify the decision to include them in Bihar.

"625. The major question which we have had to consider in the course of our examination of this problem is whether the position of Oriyas in the Sareikela subdivision is, by itself, an adequate ground for disturbing the existing arrangements. As has been pointed out eleswhere in this Report, language by itself does not, in our opinion, provide sufficient justification for breaking up a district. In this case, moreover, the Oriya percentage in rural portions is only about 26% and those speaking this language do not seem to be concentrated, anywhere within the subdivision, to such an extent that linguistic affinities can be regarded as clear and unmistakable.

"Above all, in view of the recommendations which we make in the next Chapter for the transfer of a part of Manbhum district to West Bengal, the transfer of the Seraikela subdivision or any portion thereof, to the State of Orissa will convert the Dhalbhum subdivision in the east into an enclave which will not be physically contiguous to the rest of Bihar."

In this connection the words "above all" should be carefully noted.

I will also very respectfully submit, Sir, that they have no clear geographical idea of the areas. They have not looked into the map at all. Had they done so they would have very easily realised the geographical contiguity of Sereikala subdivision with Orissa and could have suggested the transfer of that subidivision by keeping, if necessary, a corridor to approach Dhalbhum. The Report further states—

"626. This can be avoided only if the whole of Singhbhum is transferred to Orissa. Such a transfer, however, will not be justified on administrative and other grounds. It may be recalled that in 1932 the O'Donnell Committee considered the question of the transfer of this entire district as it then was to the proposed Oriya-speaking State, but declined to recommend its inclusion in Orissa, on the ground amongst others, of its retention in Chotanagpur. We see no reason why the decision reached on the basis of this recommendation should now be reconsidered."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will kindly see what grave injustice has been done to the Oriyas by the Commission. We never imagined that such distinguished gentleman of integrity and eminence could dispose of such a grave issue in this summarily manner. They seem to have been swayed away by one consideration that if Manbhum would go to West Bengal any further reduction of Bihar territories may lead to discontent in Bihar and, therefore, they quoted the three antiquated and irrelevant arguments referred to by the O'Donnell Committee somehow to repel Orissa's claim. I have already referred to these arguments before. I might repeat them now. The first part of the argument is that the Hos were against merger with Orissa; secondly, that Singhbhum had no geographical contiguity with Orissa and thirdly, it had no direct communication either by rail or road with Orissa. The Commission have ignored to reconsider the new facts placed before them with reference to these arguments. They should have seen that by now none of these arguments has any validity. Either the Commission have shut their eyes to the realities of the situation or they have first come to some conclusion and then have found arguments to support their views. I cannot conceive how they could come to such a conclusion and naturally, therefore, we feel very much aggrieved. We have very great regard for the Members of the Commission and we believe the Members of the Commission would even now feel the justfiability of our case if they themselves review. The arguments which we place deserve to be considered. The Government of India or Parliament who are going to reorganise the States will have to consider our case in the light of the principles laid down in the Report in a manner which will contribute to the unity of India. Let not grave injustice be perpetuated so as to create future troubles and unrest in India.

First the question of Hos in Singhbhum may be considered. The Commission in paragraph 667 of their Report have stated as follows:—

"We pass next to Dhalbhum. From a linguistic point of view Singhbhum district is the meeting ground of Ho, Oriya, Bengali, Hindi and Santali. These languages are important roughly in the order named.'

Thus the Hos are the most numerous, next to them are Oriyas next to them are Bengalis, next come the Hindi population. The Commission have admitted this. The Hos and Oriyas are in over whelming majority in Sareikela and Sadar subdivisions. In my preliminary remarks I have already pointed out that our of the total population of 870, 743 in Sadar and Seraikela subdivisions of Singhbhum, the Oriyas (154, 088) and Hos (396, 984) together consist of 551, 072 whereas the Hindi-speaking people are only 58, 187 and Bengalis 74, 127 and that the majority of these Hindi-speaking people are immigrants from outside Hindi-speaking areas according to the Census Report of 1951. I have further pointed out that the intervening Feudatory States have been merged with Orissa and there is greater geographical contiguity of Singhbhum with Orissa than with Bihar since Singhbhum is separated in the north from Chotanagpur by a range of hills and that there is only one road leading from Ranchi to Singhbhum and that there will be no direct rail communication to Singhbhum from Bihar if Purulia district of Manbhum is transferred to West Bengal whereas we have four direct railway lines to different parts of Orissa. In view of this I wonder how the Commission reiterated the old objections of the O' Donnell Committee and declined to reconsider the question vide their remark at the end of para, 626 of their Report. I have also dealt at length with the circumstances under which Seraikela and Kharaswan which were integrated with Orissa in January 1948, were transferred to Bihar in May 1948. as in the absence of the merger of Mayurbhanj with Orissa by that time this area proved to be an enclave and how the appointment of a tribunal was announced and how to avoid bitterness an interim arrangement was made. Now that the whole question of reorganisation of States is being considered the relevant facts should have been taken into consideration and a correct decision given. The Commission have referred to the opinion of the Hos as obtained in 1931-32 But have they taken their present opinion ? The Chief Minister of Bihar has referred to the question of referendum. I have already pointed out as to how the Ho M.L.As. and other representatives of the Hos and other communities have asked for transfer of Singhbhum to Orissa. I have also referred to the virtual referendum made in the last General Elections by the election of Shri Mihir Kabi from Seraikela constituency with the single issue of retransfer of Seraikela and Kharaswan to Orissa. I would better read out the Election Manifesto of Shri Kabi, who stood on behalf of the Ganatantra Parishad. The Election Mainfesto reads as follws:-

"Please vote for Ganatantra Parishad in the lotus-marked ballot box."

"To the sisters and brothers of Seraikela.

"The Ganatantra Parishad in their Election Manifesto have included among other things the merger of Seraikela and Kharaswan with Orissa. I am contesting the election only on the issue of merger of Kharaswan and Seraikela with Orissa. I undertake to do my best for the merger of Kharaswan and Seraikela with Orissa in the most constitutional manner I hope the sisters and brothers of Seraikela will prove that they want to merge with Orissa by voting in the lotus marked balot box for the Ganatantra Parishad. To vote for the Ganatantra Parishad is to support the case of merger with Orissa".

MIHIR KABI

Candidate for Ganatantra Parishad

Thus in the election held on adult franchise this was the only issue and they supported the demand for merger with Orissa. Five candidates contested the seat, Shri Mihir Kabi secured more votes than then total number of votes polled by the other four candidates.

The score board is given below:—

(1) Shri Mihir Kabi—Ganatantra Parishad .. 14,237 votes
(2) Shri Banabehari Mahato —Congress 4,132 „
(3) Shri Mangal Prasad —Socialist ... 1,247 „
(4) Shri Prasannakumar Sarma —Independent 469 „
(5) Shri Lopo Deogan —Jharkhand ... 7,973 „

It is thus to be seen that the other four candidates who contested the election polled togehter only 13,821 votes and Shri Mihir Kabi alone polled 14,237 votes. Thus my contention is that there has been already a referendum in that area and the popular opinion is for merger with Orissa.

The Hon'ble Deputy Leader of the Opposition says that he met Prime Minister Pandit Nehru and told him that the Adibasi Members of Singhbhum are anxious for merger with Orissa and that Pandit Nehru told him that he did not know before this that the Adibasis of Singhbhum are in favour of merger with Orissa. Under what circumstances he said this I do know. But we have already pointed this out to the Hon'ble Prime Minister in the Chief Ministers' Conference and the High Power Sub-Committee in our memorandum. I quote the relevant portion from that memorandum.

"As already stated, the ground on which the O'Donnell did not favour the transfer of Singhbhum to Orissa, namely, the Hos were opposed to such transfer, has been definitely contradicted and such transfer has been urged by the Hos of Singhbhum not only in their memoranda submitted to the Commission through various Ho organisations, but also by 7 of the 12 M. L. As. of Singhbhum district who personally appeared along with other representatives before the Commission and gave evidence to that effect. Even after the publication of the Report of the Commission, a number of such M. L. As. have represented to the Prime Minister, the Home Minister of the Government of India and the Congress President praying for the review of the recommendations of the Commission and allowing Singhbhum to be transferred to Orissa. They have made special mention of Sadar and Seraikela subdivisions in these representations".

I have got a copy of the representation submitted by them. They addressed it to Hon'ble Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister, Hon'ble Pandit Govind Ballav Pant, Home Minister and Shri U. N. Dhebar, Congress President. It is dated the 11th October 1955 and was sent from Patna. I reproduce this representation below:—

"SIR,

"We, the undersigned members of the Bihar Legislative Assembly from the district of Singhbhum beg to submit respectfully the following lines for favour of your kind consideration and sympathetic decision.

"We the people of the district of Singhbhum including Seraikela-Kharaswan and Dhalbhum are greatly shocked at the report of the States Reorganisation Commission and strongly record our protest against it in as much as it has done great injustice to us.

"It is said that the principles which weighed with the Commission to conclude their report were linguistic affinity. economic factor, administrative convenience, etc. Although all the above principles are favourable to the demand of the people of the district of Singhbhum that the entire district should be included in Orissa, the States Reorganisation Commission has done great injustice by rejecting their claim. It seems that the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission is quite in conflict with and contrary to the terms of reference. They have based their Report according to their suitability to affirm their prejudiced and pre-occupied ideas.

"The details of all the above points have already been submitted to the Commission in different memoranda. However, we would like to give a summary of the same here.

"1. The historical and geographical background will convince anybody that the district of Singhbhum was all along a part and parcel of Orissa since the Pauranic days and it has been naturally cut off from the Chotanagpur plateau by Tabo range of hills.

"2. Oriya is the principal language of the district.

"Although the Adibasis, predominantly Hos and Santhala, are in majority they speak their own tongue amongst themselves, but their second language is Oriya. They are more inclined to the Oriya language than to any other throughout the whole of the district of Singhbhum. The Sadar subdivision, the Seraikela, Kharswan and Dhalbhum areas are predominantly Oriya speaking. The culture of the entire district has got affinity with the culture of Orissa. The people of the whole district have their social relationship with the neighbouring areas of Mayrubhnaj, Keonjhar, Bonai, Bamra of the State of Orissa.

"It will not be out of place to mention here that Hos are only to be found in Singhbhum and Orissa and nowhere in Bihar. The Santals of Singhbhum have got no social relationship with the Santals of Santal Pragana which is intercepted by Manbhum and are connected with the Santals of Orissa. and feel more homely there.

"3. The economic life of the people of Singhbhum is more dependent on Orissa than Bihar. Their daily requirements such as rice, pulses, etc., are supplied from Mayurbhanj.

"Although Singhbhum is naturally endowed with many mineral resources, the sons of the soil do not derive any benefit from the same. It is being exploited by the people of Bihar.

"As a matter of fact Bihar has got no interest in the development of the standard of living of the people of Singhbhum except their colonial interest to exploit them.

"The Tata Iron and Steel Company at Jamshedpur is also more dependent on Orissa for supply of raw materials which affects the economy of Orissa rather adversely.

"It is neither logical nor humaneto facour Bihar to retain Singhbhum at the cost of the people of the district and ignoring an fundamental principles of democracy, i. e., the will of the people.

"4. There will not be any administrative difficulty or inconvenience if Singhbhum or any part thereof such as the Sadr subdivision, Seraikela, Kharaswan or Dhalbhum is included in Orissa, as either part of the district is contiguous to the State of Orissa.

"5. The problem of the Adibasis, predominantly Hos and Santals, who form majority of

the population of Singhbhum would be solved in a better way in Orissa where they will find their real home and prosperity. The Adibasis of Singhbhum have got their social relationship with their brethren of Orissa. Their culture and mode of living is more akin to those of Orissa. Their second language is Oriya. They are inclined to move towards south. They have all along been ignored and suppressed in Bihar.

"When all the above are in favour of inclusion of Singhbhum in Orissa, it has become difficult, ather painful, for us to appreciate the report of the Commission, which in our opinion, is contradicory, illogical, inconsistent and motivated to satisfy the individual and particular State of Bihar.

"The State of Bihar would not have been economically or other.wise materially affected even if the entire district of Singhbhum was included in Orissa.

"There has been a great failure of equity and justice and breach of the most fundamental principles of democracy in the report of the State Reorganisation Commission.

"It has been observed by the State Reorganisation Commission that no changes are called for the boundaries of Orissa which were fixed in 1936 after prolonged and detailed examination.

"The Commission have failed to consider properly the case of Singhbhum and specially of Seraikela and Kharswan which were no part of Singhbhum in 1936.

"Moreover these two ex-States of Seraikela and Kharswan were principally Oriya States and were first merged in Orissa in 1948 January. Those areas were temporarily kept with the administration of Singhbhum only on the solitary ground that there was no territorial contiguity with Orissa as Mayurbhanj was not merged then.

"The position of Singhbhum since 1936 has undergone many changes and in 1936 the terms of reference were not the same as at present, The Commission, it seems, have failed to appreciate the real needs and grievances of the people, rather they have been guided to satisfy the State of Bihar and safeguard its interest at the cost of the people of Singhbhum, Seraikela, Kharswan and that of the State of Orissa completely ignoring the genuine claims of Orissa over the district of Singhbhum, Seraikela and Kharswan and Dhalbhum.

"Their report does not seem to be based in the larger interest of India. They have fialed to consider that if any of the limbs, i. e., states in the bo dy. i. e., the Union of India remain weak, it would make the entire organisation invalid. With this view in mind the Commission should have recommended the inclusion of Singhbhum in Orissa which is a poor coastal State. More shocking is the ignoring and flouting attitude of the State Reorganisation Commission of the public opinion.

"You are the pioneers of the democratic India. You profess democracy. India boasts of it. But may we know, Sir, is this democracy to ignore and flout the wishes of the people ?

"Out of the twelve members of the Legislative Assembly in the district of Singhbhum, the memorialists were in majority, and we feel, when we are elected representatives of the people, ours is the voice of the people. We hope, Sir, you will agree with us that no democratic Government should ignore and flout the will of the majority of the people.

"In view of the above we would humbly request you to record our strong protest against the report of the States Reorganisation Commission.

"In the name of democracy, justice and humanity at large we further request you to consider the case of the district of Singhbhum including Seraikela, Kharswan and Dhalbhum for their inclusion in Orissa and to save the people of the district from exploitation, suppression and repression and thereby allow them to live as independent citizens of India.

(1) Sd. Sidiu Hembram, M. L. A. (Singhbhum)
(2) Sd. Mukundram Tanti, M. L. A. („)
(3) Sd. Ujendralal Ho, M. L. A. (Kharaswan)
(4) Sd. Ankura Ho, M. L. A. (Singhbhum)
(5) Sd. Mihir Kabi, M. L. A., (Seraikela)

Copy forwarded to—

(1) Shri Nabakrushna Chaudhury, Chief Minister, Orissa

(2) Shri Biswanath Das, M. P., President, U. P. C. C., Cuttack

(3) Shri R. N. Singh Deo, Maharaja of Patna, M. P.

(4) Pandit Godavaris Misra, M. L. A., President, Ganatantra Parishad, Cuttack.

for favour of necessary action".

Sir, in view of this, how can the Hon'ble Deputy Leader of the Opposition say that the Prime Minister had no knowledge of this fact ? Again, I will read out the names of the Singhbhum M. L. A. and others who signed and submitted another memorandum before the High Power Sub-Committee only in the last week, a copy of which was also sent to the Chief Minister, Orissa. They are Shri Sidiu Hembram, M. L. A. Shri Ujendralal Ho, M. L. A. Shri Ankura Ho, M. L. A., Shri Makundram Tanti, M. L. A. Shri Mihir Kabi, M. L. A., Shri Janneit Hussain, Pleader, Shri Lakshman Majhi, Pleader, Shri Lakshmi Narayan Mant, President, Ho Samaj, Ex-Chairman, Singhbhum District Board, Shri Khelaram Majhi".

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : May I request the Finance Minister to send copies of these to the authorities ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): Yes, I am going to do that. We have already communicated these facts and brought them to the notice of the Prime Minister in our memorandum. The Prime Minister, on receipt of the same was kind enough to reply acknowledging such receipt.

Hon'ble Members might have noticed that the Chief Minister, Finance Minister, Revenue Minister and the President of the Bihar Pradesh Congress Committee interviewed the High Power Sub-Committee at Delhi. They admitted in course of discussion that on linguistic grounds Bihar had no claim on Singhbhum. This was recognised by the authorities as well. It was stated that Singhbhum was kept with Chotnagpur in the interest of Adibasis who are in majority there. I would, however, point out that there are 30 lakhs Adibasis in Orissa with very substantial number in the districts contigous to Singhbhum. So their transfer to Orissa will be more in their interest specially of the Hos. It may be mentioned here as to how persistent efforts have been made to kill the mother-tongue of the local people there.

It would be interesting to know the variations in the population of different linguistic communities in the Sadr subdivision as an illustration. In 1931 the total population of this area was 535,207. It increased to 679,036 in 1951. But strangely enough the number of Oriya-speaking people went down considerably, the 1931 figure being 127,244 (24%) whereas it was 104,779(17.1%) in 1951 though the number of Bengalis increased from 6,142 (1 per cent) to 30,270 (4.9 per cent,) Hindi speaking from 31,423 to 34,544 (5.7 per cent) and Hos from 295,792 to 335,293. It shows that the population of every community increased but only that of Oriyas was reduced. In spite of this, the Oriyas still predominate in that area amongst all other non-Adibasi communities. You will be further interested to know Sir, how Hindi language was imposed on the local people at the cost of their mother-tongue during the course of the last few decades. In this connection I would quote from page 957 of the book—"Bengal under the Liutenant Governors" by C. E. Buckland, C. I. E., I. C. S., under the caption "Court Language in Bihar". which reads as follows:—

"In Sir A. Eden's time orders had been issued that either Nagri or Kaithi should be exclusively used throughout the Patna Division, and that the use in the Courts of any document in the Persian character, except as exhibits, should be absolutely forbidden. The intention of Government was that Hindi should be the language and Kaithi the character used in the Courts, Subsequent experience, however, showed that Nagri character was more easily written and more legible than Kaithi, and in accordance with the views expressed by the British Indian Association and others Sir, C. Elliott decided that Nagri character should in future be used in the Courts in Bihar, and that the Court registers should be maintained in English and Hindi. On further investigation it came to his knowledge that the difficulty of writing the Kaithi character in a legible hand, and the extent to which the Nagri character was known in Bihar had been somewhat exaggerted in the representations made to him. The Hon'ble Judges of the High Court pointed out that the law empowered the local Government to declare what was to be deemed to be the language of the Courts, but provided no authority for the issue of orders regarding the character in which such language was to be written. Sir C. Elliot accordingly cancelled his previous orders which had prescribed the use of the Nagri character and revived the orders formerly in force, under which the Kaithi character was introduced into the Courts and offices of the a Patna, Bhagalpur and Chotanagpur Divisions. But it was ordered that the headings of all registers, other than those prescribed by the High Court, kept up in the Courts and offices not in Bihar only, but throughout the Province, were in future to be printed in English only".

The Hon'ble Members will please see that in spite of imposition of Hindi in that area for half a century from 1890, only 33,000 local inhabitants are now Hindi speaking whereas the number of Oriya-speaking people is still 298.000. It can only be imagined what would havebeen their language if they had been left alone. Administrative and educational authorities had, from time to time, given their impartial opinion on the question. I am quoting a few of these here.

The Hon'ble Mr. B. Foley, I. C. S. Commissioner of the Chotanagpur Division, in his letter to the Secretary to the Government of Bihar and Orissa, Judicial Department, dated the 26th March 1919 remarked as follows:—

" " " " "

"5. It appears, however, from page 213 of the Singhbhum Gazetteer that Dhalbhum was part of the Bengal district of Midnapur until 1833, when it was transferred to Manbhum, subsequently being transferred to Singhbhum in 1846. According to page 51 of the Gazetteer the Court language for Dhalbhum is Bengali. On the other hand when touring through the west of Dhalbhum, the Kolhan, Seraikela and Kharswan. I have always been struck with the Oriya look of the villages. The houses seen to be built in the same way as in Balasore, Cuttack, Puri and the Orissa Tributary States. The question is whether it is advisable to push Bengali at the expense of Oriya or Oriya at the expense of Bengali".

"8. It is I believe true that the Bengali element has under influence in Singhbhum. But I believe same thing will be found in a less degree in Cuttack, Balasore and Puri. If it is desired to exclude Bengalis as much as possible and give more power to the Oriyas, it would seem advisable that Singhbhum should be transferred to the Orissa Division. As it is, considerable inconvenience is experienced when records come up from Seraikela and Kharswan, since no one in the Commissioner's office can translate them and it is necessary to return them for purposes of translation: Oriya has been recognised as an alternative Court language in both Seraikela and Kharswan in Mr. Jhonston's letter No. 2095-0, dated the June 1916. Oriya is the language always used I believe in the Courts in these two States and judging from the schools I visited it is also the language taught in the schools. It is to be remembered however that the families of both the Chiefs are Oriya and they are probably desirous to promote Oriya as far as possible in their States".

Mr. E. A. Gait (later Sir Edward Gait) in his Notes and Orders dated the 16th May 1906 in the File No. K. serial Nos. 1.2 of Political Department, Government of Bengal, 1905, Political, October, has remarked as follows:—

× × × × ×

"In the east of the district, i. e., Dhalbhum and half Seraikela Bengali is the local Aryan language. Elsewhere it is Oriya. The Hindi-speakers are scattered, most are found in Chaibasa and railway bazars and amongst immigrants from Ranchi in the west of the district. In the States to the west and south of Singhbhum, Ooriya is spoken by the Hinduised section of the inhabitants and it is also the court language. To the north-west, in Ranchi, Nagpuri Hindi is spoken and to the north-east, in Manbhum Bengali"

"I should have mentioned in my previous note that in our Primary Schools in Porhat and the Kolhan we are teaching Hindi. I do not know why ? Probably because Singhbhum is a part of Chota-Nagpur Commissionership. If it had been attached to Orissa I Fancy Ooriya would have got the Upperhand as it ought to have done. It is perhaps too late to make any change now in Singhbhum proper. But in Kharswan Ooriya is still the Language of the Primary Schools. There are some old Ooriya Papers in the Record Room. I did not raise this connected question

while in Singhbhum, but on several occasions. I came across persons (chiefly village headmen) who were literate in Oriya and not in Hindi. One of these men told me his father had got a Pandit from Orissa to teach him and his brothers to read and write.

"Hindi is the court language at Chaibasa and owing to this circumstance and to its being the medium of instruction in our primary schools, that language is now generally understood over a great part of Singhbhum amongst the Hindus, it is not so well understood in Kharswan. Here I had to try to make myself understood through the medium of Bengali, which is much more nearly allied to Ooriya".

Mr. Herbert A. Stark, officiating Inspector of Schools, Chota-Nagpur, in his remarks in the Visitors' Book of Kharswan M. E. School, dated the 11th April 1904, says:—

"I paid this school a brief visit of inspection, and also discussed with the Manager of the Karswan State the question of what vernacular should be employed in the schools, and what expense the State incures in education. I have a proposal in hand for giving the State Government aid. It seems to me that Uriya should be used in the schools".

Mr. H. D. Carey, Deputy Commissioner, Singhbhum, in his remarks in the Visitors' Book of the Kharswan M. E. School, dated the 16th December 1907, says:—

"Visited M. E. School. There seems to be no question at all but that Oriya is the language spoken by almost all the non-aboriginal races in this State and that failure of education hitherto is due to text-books being in a Foreign tongue. The chief's family speak Oriya also. However Bengali was the medium of instruction till 1905 when Hindi was made the medium as it is the Court language. Why Hindi was made the Court language. I can not yet ascertain, but there is no doubt that Uriya must be the medium of instruction and text-books must be in Uriya even if it is desirable to teach Hindi also".

From this it would be seen that even in 1907 the officers found this to be an Oriya-speaking area. But the Commission have stated that the Oriya question was raised here only after the merger of Seraikela and Kharswan with Bihar in 1949. I would not say that this is untrue, but I would submit that there can be no greater exhibition of misunderstanding of our case than this. I would like to quote a few more remarks to show how the mother-tongue of the Oriyas was being suppressed.

Mr. A. C. Das, Deputy Magistrate in charge of the Kharswan State in his remarks made in the Visitor's Book of the Kharswan M. E. School, dated the 11th Miarch 1908, says:—

"There can be no mistake that the school has not been looknig up of late. This evidently is owing tothe fact that boys of tender age whose mother-tongue is Oriya are taught their lessons in Hindusthani. In the 1st and 2nd Classes the pupils read the Bengali text-books. The anomaly could not have been more complete. The medium of education as the Deputy Commissioner has directed must be Oriya, the native language of the State. The Inspector of Schools suggested this on 11th April 1907 also".

On the 14th March 1913, Mr. B. C. Sen, I. C. S., Deputy Commissioner of Singhbhum, made a very significant remark in the Visitors' Book of the Kharswan M. E. Diamond Jubilee School as follows:—

"Oriya is the mother-tongue of most of the boys, yet they have to learn Hindi which is the Court language. I am told that the boys specially of the lower classes find it difficult to read the text-books in the different subjects in Hindi. The question is a difficult one, another obstacle being that Oriya is not taught in the Chaibasa Zilla School at all.

"Not a single boy ever got a scholarship from this school. The teachers should do best to remove the stigma. I am told the boys are very much handicapped by having to study two foreign languages instead of one".

On the 26th January 1914 in antoher visit the said Deputy Commissioner of Singhbhum, Mr. B. C. Sen also remarked as follows:—

"The most important question affecting the school is the introduction of Oriya as the vernacualr. There is a strong feeling among the public in the matter. Considering that the entire non-aboriginal population of both the Seraikela and Kharswan States is Oriya-speaking I do not see why it should not be the Court language of these States instead of Hindi. Unless the change is effected the substitution of Oriya for Hindi in the schools will be difficult as the boys will have to learn Hindi all the same. If both the Chiefs can agree in the matter, representation to Government will have weight. But it is for them to move in the matter in the interest of their subjects".

On the 18th December 1914 in another visit the same Deputy Commissioner, Mr. B. C. Sen made the following remarks:—

"The question of the teaching in Oriya in the school must be left to the discretion of the Chief. It seems to be wanted by the great majority of boys studying at present as the mother-tongue of most of them is Oriya".

Mr. G. E. Fawcus, Inspector of Schools, in his remarks dated the 10th January 1916 made in the Visitors' Book of Kharswan M. E. School says:-

"Oriya is being taught now in the four lower classes, but Hindi is still being taught in the four higher classes. I would suggest that Hindi should be stopped altogether now and the Oriya books for Standards I. II and III taught this year in each of the four higher classes. Next year the Oriya books for Standard IV might be taught in each of the three higher classes and soon. This will affect the question of appointing a new Head Pandit.

* * *

Oriya maps of India and the Province are needed".

Mr. A Garrett, I. C. S., Deputy Commissioner of Singhbhum, in his letter No. 57 T. C., dated Chaibasa, the 1st/10th March 1919, to the Commissioner of the Chota-Nagpur Division, remarks:

"I have the honour to address you in the cause of the Oriyas of this district.

* * *

"7. That Porahat and Dhalbhum are essentially Oriya, when they are not aboriginal, is undeniable.

"8. That Oriya is not taught in the school of these two Estates is a great wrong to the people concerned.

"9. Every argument that has been used for the non-teaching of the Oriya language in these tracts is based on the effects of the wrong that has been done in the past and is still being perpetuated.

* * *

"24. The teaching of Oriya can then be gradually extended to the higher classes at a minimum increase of educational expenditure.

"25. Further there should be an Oriya training school set up in Dhalbhum and another in Porhat.

"It is a perfectly simple matter to introduce the requisite number of trained Pandits and Gurus from Orissa".

I think this would give an idea as to how Oriya was suppressed and Hindi was foisted on the local people in Singhbhum and Seraikela. In spite of all such efforts for the last 60 years even to-day there are 289.000 Oriya-speaking people whereas among the local population Hindi-speaking people are only 33.000. Is there nobody in India to sit in judgement over this injustice done to the Oriyas ? What is the object of appointing this States Reorganisation Commission then ? It was thought that if provinces were formed with linguistic homogeneity exchange of ideas between the people and the authorities would be easier, discussions in the Legislature would be effective and popular, the education of the people would be accelerated, it would be easier to maintain law and order in the country, and thus India would become stronger. If all these aspects of the question are taken into consideration we would be able to appreciate what those impartial administrators had said and why they said so. But I am unable to understand by what standard of justice the Commission have ignored these factors. In the book "The First War of Indian Independence" of Shri Savarkar it has been described how the Raja of Singhbhum, Arjun Singh was sent to prison and his Minister, Jagu Dewan, and 40 of his followers were hanged. That they were Oriyas has been admitted by the military officers in their own accounts reproduced as Appendix to the book "Bengal under the Lieutenant Governors". It has been stated that the then ruling family of Seraikela betrayed Raja Arjun Singh, the Raja of Singhbhum. In the blood-curdling narrations about the first war of Indian independence which we get in the writings of different historians, we and that the Oriyas of Singhbhum took a prominent part in it. But now their very language and culture is dying out.

In 1821 Mr. Hamilton has recorded in his book "Hamilton's Hindustan" that Singhbhum was in Orissa and out of the six districts mentioned Singhbhum topped the list. This being the position, if the Oriyas and the Hos of the area are left out in Bihar there would remain a plague spot there, a festering sore which may ultimately hamper the solution of the problem which is being sought to be solved by the Commission. Let a fresh tribunal judge if the Hos should get better opportunity for self-expression and for improvement of their cultural and economic condition by coming to Orissa or remaining with any other State and which course would conduce to the solidarity and security of the nation. I do not say this because a small tract would come to our State. I am not swayed by any regional feeling in this case. The basic consideration weighting with us is what would be in the best interests of the people there. They will speak Oriya at home but made to speak Hindi outside. How can their language and literature progress ? There are only 33,000 Hindi-speaking local people in those areas. But 32,000 Hos know Oriya as subsidiary language. Ho, Santal and Mundas form the bulk of the people no doubt. There are 64,000 Mundas in Singhbhum. How the Hos are scattered all over the country I will presently show from the Census Report of 1951:—

In Singhbhum Sadr	353,293
In Dhalbhum excluding Jamshedpur	8,524
In Seraikela	43,691
Jamshedpur	3,664
Mayurbhanj	117,562
Keonjhar	25,650
Sundargarh	14,019
Cuttack ...	5,873
Balasore ...	2.580
Dhenkanal ...	3,627

whereas in the whole of Bihar outside Singhbhum their number is 4,520 mostly working in the mining areas. Thus the Hos of Singhbhum have their kinsmen in Orissa and their social and matrimonial relations are with the Hos of Orissa. They will never go in for such relations either with Santals or Mundas of Chotanagpur. I cannot understand why they are inviting a complicated problem in thier State by keeping these Hos with them. There are 64,000 Mundas in Singhbhum but their number in Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar, Sundargarh, Cuttack and Balasore is 75,000. The number of Santals in Sadr and Seraikela subdivisions is 44,924 but in Mayurbhanj alone their number is 246.523. So every Adibasi community of Singhbhum would feel more homely with Orissa than with Bihar. On the contrary they would suffer if Singhbhum is retained in Bihar. For 60 years Hindi has been forced down their throat. but they have not accepted it. For Bihar this is bound to prove a trouble spot.

Considerable criticism has been levelled against this side of the House by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on this subject. I had no mind to refer to some of the incidents which were deplorable indeed. But our position is extremely embarassing and we are forced to speak out the unpleasant truth. The main reason which led to the integration of Seraikela and Kharaswan with Bihar was the conspiracy between the so-called "Praja party of Seraikela" and some leaders of Bihar. Seraikela and Kharaswan were at first merged in Orissa. There was lawlessness which resulted in the transfer of these two areas to Bihar in May 1948. This was followed by further troubles and the object for which the members of the so-called Praja Party gave away Kharswan and Seraikela to Bihar was frustrated. A Goodwill Mission was set up to visit Seraikela-Kharswan on behalf of the Koshalotkal Praja Parishad in August 1948. The following were members of the Good-will Mission:

(1) Shri Rajendra Narayan Singh Deo (Leader). Maharaja of Patna—President of the Koshalotkal Praja Parishad

(2) Shri Rama Prasad Misra—Working President, Koshalotkal Praja Parishad

(3) Shri Raj Ballav Misra—Secretary Koshalotkal Praja Parishad

(4) Shri Sundarmani Patel—Member,

Working Committee, Koshalotkal Praja Parishad

(5) Shri Surendra Mohanty (now M. P.)—Editor, Janata, Cuttack

The leader of the Good-will Mission sent a letter to the Prsident of the Parishad from Calcutta on the 10th August 1949 which has been reproduced in their printed report. I am quoting the relevant paragraphs from it. They read as follows:—

"16. In course of our recording evidence in many places we were told that during the Union movement the leaders of Seraikela Praja Samity of which Shri B. Singh Deo, Pattayat Sahab of Seraikela Raj, was the General Secretary were inciting the people for separation of these two States from Orissa. We sought clarification on this point from the leading members of the Praja Samity. We are recording below the exposition of the Praja Samity, which we believe would go a long way in clearing a lot of confused thinking.

"17. After the integration of the Orissa States with the Province on the 1st January 1948, a mass movement was started in the Orissa States, for creation of a Union of the Orissa States. With the past historical backgound it is no wonder that Seraikela became the cradle as well as the hub of the movement. The demonstrations against integration which resulted in the Kharaswan tragedy on the 1st January 1948, helped to add fuel to the fire and also confused the issues. The original resentment against integration pure and simple was misconstrued as anti-Orissa feeling and was unfortunately fully exploited by Bihar".

In paragraph 19 it has been recorded:

"19. The Unionists thereafter began to search for a footboard, from where they could keep the movement alive. At this moment the Congress leaders of Bihar stepped in as ardent protagonists of the movement for creation of a Union. Prominent Bihar papers like the "Indian Nation" and the "Searchlight" began to advocate the cause of the Unionists with all the emphasis at their command, The "Indian Nation" of Patna in an editorial of its issue, dated the 30th April 1948, observed—

"The Congress must move the Government of India to study the new situation to tell the people of the Eastern States if the version given in the Press Note of the Orissa Government by way of justifying the ban on the movement for Union is valid or not".

Biharee leaders like Shri Rambinode Singh, M. L. A., Shri Ramkrishna Upadhya and Prof. Hayward, etc. were instigating the people of these two States to rise against Orissa Government for the creation of a Union (vide a news items in the "Indian Nation", dated the 30th April 1948, reprinted in the Appendices). To dupe the people still further, important Biharee leaders entered into an agreement with the Unionists of Seraikela at Ranchi on the following 16 points, the first and foremost among which was:—

"To form the Union of the Eastern States into a Province on the model of Saurastra Province and until this is done the following facilities should be guaranteed:—

"(a) Oriya residents in these areas who have stayed for more than three generation should not be questioned or required to take Domicile Certificate. They should be treated as natives on production of sufficienct, evidence production of sanads, pattas or any other documents granted by the Ruler if he was a State subject or still remains a State subject when the terms of the agreement comes into force, or he had acquired domicle according to the State laws.

"(b) Facility of study of Oriya-speaking people.

"(c) Local holidays should be recognised and holidays be given on local festivals in preference to holidays which are not locally observed with festivities,

"(d) State-aid should be given to preserve the local culture, e. g. the Chau Dance and local public festivities or worship concerning all the people of the State, e. g., Jantal, Nuakhia Jantal, Paudi Mela.

"(e) Encouragement should be given to local talents by way of employment in local as well as in Provincial Administrations. No discrimination should be made in the services. In consideration of the backwardness of the people inhabiting the area, special considertion be made in employment. Weightage in certain spheres".

In clauses (f) to (o) various terms and conditions regarding employment, mining concession, development schemes of the Darbar administration, etc., were also stipulated. Under (n) the following was provided:—

"(n) Local Autonomy-The Province should administer only those subjects which cannot be administered locally for want of finance, or for the magnitude of its scheme or for any other reason".

The Report in the end further states:—

"20. 'Thus it will be seen' the President of the Praja Samity concluded 'the choice before the people of Seraikela, Kharswan was neigther Bihar nor Orissa, We wanted a union and Bihar supported it. Even the Congress President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad blessed Mayurbhanj when it remained separate from Orissa, presumably with a view to ultimately grab it. Therefore there is no denying the fact that the Seraikela Praja Samity wanted temporary separation of the two States from Orissa, from where the movement for a Union could spread. But Bihar in the end duped us. We were played into the hands of Bihari leaders little knowing that we were going to satisfy the territorial lusts of Bihar. It is no wonder if the States Ministery were misled under the circumstances into believing that the people of these two States were anti Orissa and therefore were pro-Bihar, and the third alternative of the Union and the demand for the right of self-determination which were the crux of the problem were forgotten. It is a pity that the original idea of the tribunal consisting of Justice Bhavdekar of the Bombay High Court, to ascertain the wishes of the people of these States was given up, otherwise the present tragedy of suppression of language and culture and oppression and suffaring of a sentitive people might have been avoided. Even then the Ruler of Seraikela in his reply, dated the 23rd May 1948 to Maharaja Nagendra Singh's letter, dated the 21st May 1948, made it abundantly clear that the integration of the two States with Bihar must be for the interim period only. He also clearly defined the provision that the final scheme of integration of these two States must depend on the verdiet of the people who should be ultimately consulted' (vide Appendices)".

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : Is that the

opinion of this Good-will Mission ? How far will it help us to achieve our object ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): I consider it proper to read it out here because the Biharis have been asserting that on merit and due to trouble by the Adibasis, Seraikela and Kharaswan went to Bihar. They plead that they had nothing to do with it and they have not soiled their hands over this question. But I think the position should be fully exposed. The fact is, these people were out to form a separate Union and Bihar leaders took advantage of it. It is not on linguistic or economic or cultural grounds that these two former States went to Bihar as a result of this machination. But while myself and the President of the Utkal Provincial Congress Committee were at Delhi recently the Chief Minister of Bihar referred to some letter of Dr. H. K. Mahtab the then Chief Minister of Orissa and a Government of India communique on the subject of integration of Seraikela-Kharswan with Bihar, We contacted Dr. Mahtab on the subject at Bombay who kindly sent a telegram which I would like to share with the House. Some time ago there was also a news paper report that when Dr. Mahtab was the Chief Minister of Orissa he alongwith the Chief Ministers of Bengal, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh issued a joint statement to the effect that there should be no further controversy over the boundary question and that it has been finally decided. On our approach Dr. Mahtab sent the following telegraphic message:—

"Apropos your telephonic talk with me regrding inclusion of Seraiklela and Kharaswan in Orissa Stop Do not know line of discussion so cannot write anything to anybody Stop Myself submitted a memorandum to S. R. C. Stop If reference is made to me by Prime Minister or Congress President shall explain whatever I know"

Hon'ble Members are aware that he had submitted a memorandum to the States Reorganisation Commission on this subject, It is only proper that it should be recorded in our proceedings so that it may come to the notice of the Government of India and the Parliament as to the circumstances under which Seriakela-Kharaswan was transferred to Bihar. Dr. Mahtab, while addressing the Chairman of the Commission,stated:—

"Dear Sir, by this time you must have received a number of memorandum from various organisations and also individuals, regrding inclusion of certain out-lying Oriya-speaking tracts in the State of Orissa. It is not my purpose to add to the number of those memoranda. My purpose is to draw your special attention to only one point; namely, reinclusion of Seraikela and Kharswan in Orissa. You have received a number of representations on this point as well. If I am not mistaken all the representations which have been submitted to you must have pressed among other things reinclusion of Seraikela and Kharaswan in Orissa. Since I, as the then Chief Minister of Orissa, was one of the prime actors on the stage when the inclusion and separation of Sareikela and Kharswan took place. I think I ought to make a special pleading for rainclusion of these areas in Orissa. Dr. K. N. Katju also, who was then the Governor of Orissa and who is now the Home Minister, may be consulted as to his own feelings about the matter. I attach herewith three copies of 'The beginning of the End' written by me and endorsed by Sardar Vallabhai Patel with a forward for your kind perusal. I do not send you some other literature such as the Report of the Orissa States Enquiry Committee, 1938 of which I was the Chairman, for I think the book which I send will indicate to you how the former princely States were merged, what efforts were made for the purpose and what odds had to be surmounted. The part which I was called upon to play in that drama compels me to request you most earnestly to consider whether Seraikela and Kharaswan should not be reamalgamated with Orissa.

"I would request you to kindly go through the marked portion of pages 23 and 24 of the book atteched, which runs as follows:—

"In whatever circumstances the States might have been merged with the province, most of the Rulers reconciled themselves to the new order of things and they realised that Sardar Patel had done them the greatest service by securing to them the privy purse in perpetuity and also safety from any kind of popular agitation which was bound to come, had not the States merged with the Province. But a few Rulers did not and could not reconcile themselves to what happened on the 14th of December 1947. Immediately after signing the Agreement at Cuttack, they conspired to revive the Union Movement. They set up a secret organisation and concentrated their activities in Seraikela and Kharswan, the administration of which two States was made over to Orissa, Here it may be noted that the Bihar Government wanted those two States to merge with Bihar on the ground that the majority of these two States were aborigines and geographically these two States were parts of Singhbhum. Naturally a controversy arose between Bihar and Orissa on this issue. The conspiring Rulers found an opportunity to carry on their activity in Seraikela for the revival of the Union. These misguided gentlemen thought that they would have the protection of the Bihar Government against vigilance of the Orissa Government. Organised violent activities were planned and a large-scale rebellion was contemplated and worked out in Seraikela. Orissa Government had to ban the Union Movement in the Province of Orissa. The Union Movement completely eclipsed the main point regarding the merging of Seraikela and Kharaswan either with Bihar or with Orissa. The agitation of the aboriginals for merging with Bihar and the Union activities of the Rulers in which major portions of Oriya-Speaking population knowingly or unknowingly paricipated, brought about almost a chaotic situation in Seraikela and Kharaswan. Administration there had to be carried on with the help of the Military Police which was not a pleasant job after all. Ultimately, the Government of India stepped in and decided that Seraikela and Kharasan, being two island States in the district of Singhbhum, over which Orissa had all along established a claim, would merge with the district of Singhbhum that is to say, the administration of these two States should go along with the administration of Singhbhum, to whichever province district might be attached in course of time. Since Singhbhum is with Bihar now, these two States went over to Bihar, much to the resentment of the Orissa public. Here the question was not the amalgamation of

the Oriya-speakihg tracts but whether the States should be merged with the Province or should form themselves into a Union completely separate from the Province of Orissa. The decision of the Government of India to merge Seraikela and Kharaswan with Bihar completely upset the plans of those Rulers who were conspiring for a Union".

"This will show in what circumstances Seraikela and Kharaswan which had originally been merged with Orissa was temporarily retransferred to Bihar. The fact of the matter is that some Rulers who were all along opposed to merger did not accept the decision of Sardar Patel with good grace. They tried hard to undo what was done and carried on what was known as the Union Movement. In order to further this Movement they successfully played Bihar against Orissa. Their object was not merger with Bihar but undoing the merger itself. The issue which was brought to a head for decision by Government of India and for us to consider was whether the arrangement of merger should be upheld or should provincial sentiment get the better of a great 'political decision'. It was urgent also to dispose of this matter as quickly as possible, because Government of India was then getting ready for Police action in Hyderabad which would, as it was thought then take some years for successful termination. Internal peace was essential when such a big venture as taking over Hyderabad by force was embarked upon. It was unfurtunate that Bihar took undue advantage of this abnormal situation and started a bitter controversy which has been referred to in the J. V. P. Report. Orissa at that time, showed greater sense of responsibility and greater regard for national interest, first by strongly adhering to the decision of merger with whatever province as against the agitation for annualling the merger and secondly by not carrying too an inter-provincial controversy while the country was embarking upon a great venture in Hyderabad. In all fairness, Orissa should not be called upon to pay for it for all time to come.

"You will please notice in the book attached and also it may come to your notice in the course of your examination of the case that the Raja of Seraikala who has considerable influence over the people there expressed himself on many occasions against Orissa. This has been misconstrued and misrepresented as his partiality for Bihar. As a matter of fact he was all along opposed to merger. He fought merger before and tried to undo it later. Now that the question of merger has been finally settled and the issue is dead, he is anxious to be with his kith and kin in Orissa. People of Seraikela are anxious to come back to Orissa. Seraikela and Kharaswan are two small ex-states having a population of about two lakhs only. But much sentiment is centred round reamalgamation of this area with Orissa. They are Oriya areas. They were connected with Orissa in many ways before merger. They were rightly merged with Orissa. Then a wrong was done for political expediency in the national interest and it should be corrected now.

Yours sincerely,
H. K. MAHTAB, M. P.
Ex-Chief Minister of Orissa"

I would request the Hon'ble Deputy Leader of the Opposition not to concentrate his attention on picking holes, but to help in securing unanimity over our demand. This is our just claim. There is no question of conquest or annexing a territory. We should present our case reasonably and dispassionately. Then alone, I believe, Parliament, the Government of India and the Congress High Command would accept it. We should consider from the point of view of administrative convenience, cultural unity and facilities for communication and such other considerations. Bihar cannot provide facilities for development of the Oriya language nor will the Hos feel at home in Bihar cut off from their kinsmen in Orissa. In our memorandum we have dealt exhaustively with facts and given detailed account of every thing. We have now placed them before the Government of India. My friend, Shri Bijoy Kumar Pani, M. L. A., has pointed out that in 1916 the Rajas of Dhalbhum and Singhbhum submitted a memorial in which they prayed for making Oriya the Court language of their States. In that document they submitted that they were facing difficulties on this account. All these matters have been included in our memorandum. The Hon'ble Member from Banpur has given some figures which, I submit, are not correct. He has said that according to the Census of 1951 the number of Oriyas was considerably higher than all other communities in Dhalbhum. This is not correct. There the number of Oriyas is according to 1951 Census 1,28,492 as against 1,25,108 Hindi-speaking and 1,85,832 Bengali-speaking people.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : I was referring to the Census of 1931.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): There the Hindi-speaking people are 21.3 per cent, Oriyas 21.1 per cent, Hos 2 per cent and Bengalis 30.8 per cent.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : There is a slight inaccuracy. There is no reason why Jamshedpur should be included while working out the figures. The number of Oriyas is more even now in Dhalbhum.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): Yes, in certain areas of Dhalbhum Oriyas are more than Hindi and Bengali-speaking people. Excluding all the towns including Jamshedpur the percentage of different communities according to 1951 Census is given below: In Chaibasa and Manjhari police-stations (excluding Chaibasa town) Hos are 72 per cent, Hindi-speaking people 3.6 per cent, Bengalis 4.6 per cent and Oriyas 15.7 per cent. In Jhinkapani and Majham police-stations the Hindi-speaking people are only 1.7 per cent, Bengalis 4.8 per cent wheres Oriyas are 18 per cent and Hos 73 per cent. Then Manoharpur Revenue thana and Jamda police-station excluding Manoharpur, Goa and Nuamundi towns, the Hindi-speaking people form only 5.3 per cent. Bengalis 4.3 per cent whereas the per centage of Oriyas is 18.1 and that of Hos is 46. In Chakradharpur area excluding Chakradharpur town the Hindi-speaking people are 11 per cent, Bengalis 5.5 per cent. Oriyas 16 per cent and Hos. 35.3 per cent. In Seraikela subdivision excluding Seraikela and Kharaswan towns the Hindi-speaking people are 16.1 per cent, Oriyas 33.3 per cent, Bengalis 29.6 per cent and Santalis 20.6 per cent. In Golmuri, Jugsulia police-stations excluding Jamshedpur city the Hindi-

speaking people form 7 per cent, Oriyas 8.2 per cent, Bengalis 26.2 per cent, Hos 4.2 per cent and Santals 54. In Chakulia, and Bahadagoda police-stations, excluding Musabani and Mahubhandar town the Hindi-speaking people are 9.4 per cent, Oriyas 38.5 per cent, Bengalis 37.8 per cent, Hos 1.4 per cent and Santals 12.7 per cent. In the town areas of Chai bassa, Chakradharpur, Manoharpur, Goa, Nuamundi, Seraikela, Kharaswan, Musabani and Mahubhandar the Hindi-speaking people form 41.5 per cent of the population whereas Oriyas are 21.3 per cent. Bengalis 12.5 per cent and Hos 6.4 per cent.

Sir, I do not consider it necessary to give here the figures concerning the number of people speaking different languages in Jamshedpur. I am just referring to the position in the rural areas. The Hon'ble Members will find that everywhere in the rural areas Oriyas predominate. There is not a single area where the Hindi-speaking people are in a majority. I am, therefore, unable to understand why the States Reorganisation Commission have not taken this very important factor into consideration, whereas they have done so elsewhere. I do not want to repeat what I have already said while moving the motion. I would only appeal that we should adopt the amended motion unanimously. Every body including the Adibasis has felt it very keenly. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has raised the question of a corridor and suggested that 6 or 7 villages could have been left to Bihar in the north-east corner of Seraikela subdivision and the rest amalgamated with Orissa. I have already referred to that in my speech earlier. But I would like to submit here that while going to Koraput we have to pass through Viziangram in Andhra. If we are to travel in Orissa's territory alone we should have Vizianagram included within the boundaries of Orissa. But since the facilities of a road are there, we take advantage of it. We do not meet any difficulty on this account. Why should Bihar then have difficulty in the absence of a corridor ? Are the States foreign countries to each other ? Because one State Government has not a road in its territory to go to a particular area would any other State Government prevent it form availing of the facilities of a road lying under the latter's jurisdiction ? That could not be. I hope that the Government of India and the Hon'ble Members of Parliament would take this matter into consideration and do justice.

Some Hon'ble Members have raised the question of Jharkhand. There has been elaborate discussion on this subject. I do not propose to refer to it once more. I would only submit that on this subject a memorandum was submitted to the States Reorganisation Commission which was signed by 34 Adibasi members of the Bihar Assembly. In that memorandum they submitted—

"Panchkot covers 2/3 of the present districts of Manbhum. The district of Manbhum was created by the Regulation of 1833. According to his Regulation, Manbhum included Dhalbhum and also the district of Burdwan. Until 1845, Dhalbhum was a part of Manbhum and it was included with the district of Singhbhum. The other half of the district of Singhbhum has been known as "Kolhan". Kolhan area the homeland of the Hos, never belonged to Bihar. Thus the districts of Manbhum and Singhbhum weren to with Bihar". (Page 7 of their printed memorandum)

They have repeatedly stated that they do not want to remain in Bihar. We are not, of course, concerned with this. But this is their attitude regarding Bihar. Let us take another instance. The district of Singhbhum comprises different areas. In this connection I would refer to a representation submitted by the Maharaja of Mayurbhanj, under his seal to His Excellency Lord Mountbatten, the then Viceroy, Governor-General and Crown Representative of India, in which he showed that due to circumstances beyond his control a part of his teritory was included in Singhbhum. He demanded that those parts be restored to him. Singhbhum had no relation with Bihar. It is clear that it was directly connected with the Oriyas and the Orissa Feudatory States. We have collected all available data and given them in our memorandum. In the face of all these facts, if our case was not taken into consideration, I would say, it was a Himalayan blunder on the part of the Commission. When such a blunder is committed discontent will begin to smoulder and this will ultimately burst into a situation which may go beyond control. The leaders of Bihar has stated before the States Reorganisation Commission that the two States of Seraikela and Kharaswan were all along included in Chotanagpur. But they have not said how many other States were also included in Chotanagpur. On a reference to page 55 of the Census of India, 1931-Vol. XII—Central Provinces and Berar Part I- Report, it would be found that the five States of Jaspur, Suruguja, Udaipur, Korea and Chandbhakar etc. were also in Chotanagpur. How is it then that these States are now in Madhya Prepesh ? Why not the Bihar leaders claim these on the ground that they were with Chotanagpur and the States Reorganisation Commission tsansfer them to Bihar ? I cannot follow the logic of these assertions of Bihar leaders. The matter should be considered on its own merit.

Now let us take the case of Oriya-speaking areas in Madhya-Pradesh. Madhya Pradesh was created in 1861 and its first Administration Report was published in 1962 as "Report on the Administration of the Central Provinces for the year 1862". In that report at pages 78-79 under paras 373 and 376 Sambalpur and the dependencies consisting of the native States have been mentioned. In paragra'h 376 it has been stated, "The dependencies of Sambalpur consist of the Garjat Tributory States, 13 in number, as named in the margin". These thirteen are—Patna, Sonepur, Bamra, Kalahandi, Khariar, Rairakhol, Raigrh, Bargarh, Sarangarh, Phuljhar, Sakti, Bindra-Nuagarh, Borasambar. Till 1861 these were with Orissa and togehter with Orissa were included in the Bengal Province. In 1905 when Sambalpur was amalgamated with Orissa, Phuljhar was also recommended to be included in Orissa. Shri C. D. Deshmukh, present Finance Minister of India, who was the Settlement Officer of Central Provinces in 1930-31 and who conducted the settlement in Phuljhar Zamindary, wrote about Phuljhar, "The bulk of the population, however, consists of "Uriya" and "Laria" (Chhatisgarh immigrants). This we have also mentioned in our memorandum. I had also mentioned this fact in Delhi recently in the presence of Shri Deshmukh. As has been pointed out by the Deputy Leader of the Opposi-

tion, our claim over this area included Phuljan which is Mahasamund Rural A. At first the Census Report of 1951 of Madhya Pradesh was not available to us. We wrote to the Registrar-General, collected data from him and submitted a supplementary memorandum on this question. We have given detailed figures in it. There is no use arguing it once again. During the Chief Ministers' Conference we submitted a memorandum to the Government of India concerning Phuljhar, Bastar and other outlying areas in Madhya Pradesh. This is what we have witten regarding Phuljhar.

"Phuljhar Zamindary was a part of the Sambalpur district until 1905 when with the exception of Phuljhar the rest of Sambalpur district was transferred to Bengal from the Central Provinces. It has always been an Oriya tract. Even in 1931 Oriyas by race and mother-tongue numbered 82,305 which works out at 50 per cent of the total population of 1,65,353 of the Phuljhar Zamindary. In 1951, out of the total population 2,74,597 in Mahsamund Tahsil Rural A, which corresponds roughly to Phuljar, Oriyas are 1,46,081 or 53 per cent. The Chhatisgaris number 89,528 or 32 per cent and the Hindi-speaking people number 36,117 or 13 per cent of the total population of Mahasamund Tahsil Rural A. Thus Oriyas by themselves are in a clear majority in Mahasamund tahsil Rural A or in the Cencsus tract in which Phuljhar is situated. If the Chhatisgarhi population of 32 per cent is also taken into account as linguistically they have greater affinities with the Oriyas, then we have 53 plus 32 per cent, i e., 85 per cent of Oriyas and people having greater linguistic affinities with the Oriyas in a total population of 2,74,597. Clearly, therefore, this is an Oriya tract and should be transferred to Orissa according to the principles laid down in para 117 of their Report by the States Reorganisation Commission. Even in 1931 three were 44 per cent Oriyas in the Phuljar Zamindary. This tract of about 842 sq. miles. if transferred, will also be geographically contiguous to Sambalpur district of Orissa with which it has economic and trade relations."

It would be seen that we have placed those claims which we considered just and reasonable. The O' Donnell Committee have stated that none supported the amalgamation of these areas with Orissa. I submit that the O' Donnell Committee has done injustice to Oriyas. Let me point out that as soon as the Report of the Committee was published the people of those areas submitted a petition to the Commissioner of that Province. Shri N. Senapati, I. C. S., who is now the President of our Board of Revenue and was then Deputy Commissioner, Sambalpur, wrote to the Government then about the matter. He wrote that about 100 people of Phuljhar were waiting at the Circuit House, Sambalpur, to give evidence but the Committee did not accept this.

I would just read out the claims we raised in connection with the outlying tracts in Madhya Pradesh for the information of the Hon'ble Members. I have already referred to Phuljhar. I would confine myself to matters relating to other areas in this State.

BINDRA-NUAGARH AND DEBHOG

In Mahasamund Tahasil Rural B which includes Bindra-Nuagarh and Debhog among other areas there are 11 per cent Oriyas or 50,929 out of a total population of 269,919. Out of this total population, Chatisgaris number 58,329 or 23 per cent and Hindi-speaking people are 1,54,491 or 57 per cent. As the census tract also includes areas which are not strictly speaking Oriya tracts, the percentage of Oriya population is somewhat less than in Mahasamund Tahsil Rural A. The Oriya percentage that is found in Mahasamund Tahsil Rural B is mostly confined to Bindra-Nuagarh and Debhog which are contiguous to the Kalahandi district of Orissa. As a matter of fact Debhog is an enclave of Madhya Pradesh in the Kalahandi district of Orissa. As the Chatisgaris speakers have greater affinities with the Oriyas and as Debhog and Bindra-Nuagarh of the census tract of Mahasamund Tahsil Rural B are purely Oriya areas having trade and economic relations with the neighbouring district of Kalahandi, their transfer to Orissa from Madhya Pradesh will be justified on linguistic, administrative and economic considerations.

SANKARA TRACT

The five villages of Sankara, Rabo, Mahodi, Bharatpur and Rampur of the ex-State of Sarang garh are known as the Sankara tract and are surrounded by the Ambabhona police-station of the Sambalpur district. This tract is cut off from the Madhya Pradesh territory on all the four sides with the result that one cannot reach the tract from Madhaya Pradesh without having to cross the Sambalpur district. The excise administration of these villages is being looked after by the Deputy Commissioner, Sambalpur, since 1911. The total population of these villages is 3,657 and their area is roughly four square miles or 2,827 acres. The predominant majority of the population is Oriya. All their relations and marriage connections are with the neighbouring people of the Bargarh subdivision of Sambalpur district. Most of them have found employment now in the Hirakud Project which is under construction in the Sambalpur district of Orissa. Their trade and other economic activities are also with the neighbouring Orissa markets, which are nearer to them than the Madhya Pradesh markets. These five villages, which are an enclave of Madhya Pradesh in Orissa, have therefore greater affinity and connections with the Sambalpur district than with Madhya Pradesh. Their transfer to the administrative control of the Orissa Governments is, therefore, desirable not only from the point of view of better administration of the area but also from that of the people living in that tract.

BASTAR

The four tahsils of Jagadalpur, Kodagaon, Dantewara and Konta, which Orissa has claimed from Madhya Pradesh are continuous to the Koraput district of Orissa and are to be the west of the district. It adjoins the district from Umerkot and Kotpad to Motu. The total area of Bastar is 13,062 square miles and the area of the four tahsils claimed is 6,881 square miles with a total population of 605,587.

2. According to the census of 1931 Oriyas numbered 45,830 (8.5 per cent) and in 1951 their number was 61,089 (8 per cent) in the old Bastar State. All this Oriya population is confined to the above mentioned four taluks generally. The O'Donnell Committee have stated that Oriyas by mother-tongue and race are 10 per cent of the total population of Bastar State. Thus the

Oriya-speakers are greater in number than the Andhras who are less than 8%. Hindi-speakers form only 4% of the population in both the Censuses of 1931 and 1951. Half of the Hindi-speakers at the Census of 1931 were speakers of Chatisgarhi which the Oriyas claim as a dialect of Oriya.

3. The bulk of the rest of the population are Gonds and Murias. In 1941 there were 134,864 Gonds in Orissa and 177,500 in the former Orissa States which are now merged with Orissa. Therefore, the Gonds are not likely to be affected by their transfer to Orissa.

4. As regards Murias, they are only confined to Bastar State and are not to be found anywhere else in Madhya Pradesh.

5. The economy of Bastar is closely linked with that of Koraput and there is free flow of trade between Jagadalpur and the other tahsils of Bastar and Koraput district.

6. If we take all these factors into account and the fact that Halbi which claims a good number of speakers is a dialect of Oriya, Orissa claim to the four above mentioned tahsils of Bastar becomes stronger. In paragraph 480 of their Report the Commission mentioned that the Andhra claim to Bastar cannot be conceded because their claim to Koraput has been rejected. If follows, therefore, that the State which has Koraput district has a greater claim than any other on Bastar.

Sir, I would not take any more time of the House. I would only submit that we have given in our memorandum whatever evidence was to be adduced and whatever data were to be given.

I believe that when this Reorganisation of States is being planned on a permanent basis Members of Parliament and the Government of India under the leadership of the great Prime Minister would take into consideration all the facts submitted by us and do justice to our cause. We are not actuated by any parochial consideration or any fear of defeat in the next elections. Congress is the only organisation which has tried its best to uphold the unity of India. It is also the organisation which has brought freedom to the country. The leaders of this great organisation would not countenance anything which would even remotely endanger the unity of the country. Even the slightest deviation from this path will bring reflection on this great organisation. That is why this question should not be judged from a narrow point of view. We do not want to create any disorder in the country. We will proceed strictly on the path of constitutionalism. But we must emphatically assert our case. Let the other parties unite and stand by us. It is unfortunate that the Chairman of the Commision could not participate in the consideration of our case. Only two Members dealt with it. Supposing they had differed, who could decide the issue ? Under these cirumstances it is no use blaming the Commission either. The Commission have, however, laid down a number of extremely useful suggestions on general matters. They have suggested safeguards for the linguistic minorities in the fourth part of their Report. The Commission have also recommended the abolition of the office of the Raj Pramukh and 'C' class States and reorganisation of India into 16 States. They have recommended appointment of the Members of the Public Service Commission by the President and 50 per cent of the High Court Judges from different States, etc. These are very important matters. There are other important questions also in thier Report. These should be considered in this House. I would request you, Sir, to allot some time on some other occasion for discussion of these matters which could not be discussed during this debate. Lastly I would submit most respectfully that there should not be raised any uncessary controversy amongst ourselves over this important issue. Let us faithfully and emphatically place our case before the Government of India, who, I am sure, would do justice.

Shri HARIHAR DAS (Aska) : Sir, no reference has been made to our claims on the outlying areas in the south.

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): In our memorandum and supplementary memorandum we have submitted detailed claims over the southern areas.

I would again submit that we have placed all those claims which we considered just and reasonable. I thank the Hon'ble Members for giving me a patient hearing. Now the Chief Minister will explain certain aspects of the question. I accept the amendment moved by Hon'ble Member Shir Bijoy Kumar Pani.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : There is nothing in the memorandum submitted by the Congress about the outlying areas in the south. The Hon'ble Finance Minister also has not referred to this question in his speech. When the Hon'ble Member from Aska referred to this question he only uttered a word or two and then kept quiet. Has he let out our claims over the southern outlying areas for all times to come ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): We have raised all these claims in our memorandum. In addition to that we have submitted special claims and further arguments regarding some areas in particular as some new materials become available after publication of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission. There was nothing new, however, to be placed regarding southern areas.

Shri PRATAP KESHARI DEO : Can you say why special claim was not raised in respect of the southern areas ?

Shri RADHANATH RATH (Minister): Sir there is a proverb in English "A fool uttereth all his mind". I am not going to play the role of a fool. I believe, God helps those who help themselves.

Shri NABAKRUSHNA CHAUDHURY (Chief Minister): Mr. Speaker, Sir the Hon'ble Member from Kalahandi had once before created history when on a previous occasion a sub-committee was unanimously constituted in this Assembly after discussion obout our den and for the merger of Seraikela and other outlying tracts into this State. The Hon'ble Member gave an independent opinion. At that time I had to appeal to him to forget the past. I have never blamed him nor am I blaming him now but the injury of his heart has not yet healed and he seems to get excited every now and then. While delivering his speech to-day, he has raised many unnecessary topics. The Finance Minister and I have already replied to those points on other occasions. Whenever there has been a discussion on this subject, he has raised the same topic

over and over again. The Finance Minister has given a satisfactory explanation in that connection. The Hhn'ble Member was not present when the Finance Minister was speaking and naturally be has not probably heard what he said. If he coolly deliberates over the issue and realises that our demand is still under consideration and that we have every hope that justice would be done to us, he would certainly discuss the subject in a much cooler mood. Instead, he is repeatedly blaming Dr. Mahtab and is repeatedly harping in that one point without mentioning how the Ruler of Seraikela behaved and to what extent the Union movement of the Eastern States Agency was responsible for this. What Dr. Mahtab did and under what circumstances has already been explained to the Assembly. The Government of India are also aware of the position. The arguments which are being advocated by the Hon'ble Members are similar to those that are being advocated on behalf of the Bihar Government. It is understandable that when one is agitated over any particular issue, to a very great extent, and when one's personal interests are at stake, there is confusion in thought and action. Time alone will heal the wound of the Hon'ble Member.

Whatever that may be, there has been a good deal of excitement over the S. R. C. Report. It is a matter of satisfaction, however, that the excitement and the mob violence which were expected in some quarters as a result of the publication of the S. R. C. Report, has nowhere taken place. The Hon'ble Member has himself admitted that in Orissa the demonstrations were symbolic. We have reasons to be proud over this. In Orissa, nowhere, any serious untoward incident has taken place. However, small our demand may be in the context of the major reorganisation the problem has naturally become for us a very big issue. The States Reorganisation Commission was created with a view to advise on the problem of a national reorganisation of States. The main issues before them were not to settle the boundaries of States like Orissa, Bengal, Andhra, etc., or the problem of providing a corridor for Bengal. In the resolution passed by the Government of India, it had been made clear that it was not the business of the Commission to go into details of the boundaries. I personally believe that the States Reorganisation Commission itslef become swayed with the amount of eagerness that was displayed by all of us. That is why they began to worry over problems for which they were not charged with the responsibility. But they have not actually been able to give any consideration to the boundry problems of Orissa. That is why we are criticising them. But it must be said to their credit that they have found out satisfactory solutions for the main issues with which they were charged. I think no other Commission would be able to do what they were able to do in such a short time. In the resolution of the Government of India, the following direction had been given to the Commission:—

"The Commission will investigate the conditions of the problem, the historical background, the existing situation and the bearing of all important and relevant factors thereon. They will be free to consider any proposal relating to such reorganisation. The Government expect that the Commission would, in the first instance, not go into the details, but make recommendations in regard to the broad principles which should govern the solution of this problem and, if they so choose, the broad lines on which particular States should be reorganise, and submit interim reports for the consideration of Government".

The problems of Orissa or of Bengal are not problems of reorganisation. Our problems are results of history. When the first Orissa province was created, about half of the Oriya population remained outside in the Eastern States. To bring in the Oriyas who remained in the neighbouring (then British) provinces, the Utkal Sammilani started their agitation. We had our sympathies for them. But the Utkal Sammilani never raised the question of amalgamating the 60 lakhs of Oriyas remaining in the Eastern States. They were perhaps of the view that the Oriya States lying in the Eastern States Agency were parts of natural Orissa. They presumed that they already formed parts of Orissa. We, however, knew that after the British Government leave India, the people of the States will be freed from the despotism of the Rulers and automatically the States will merge with Orissa. So when in 1936-37, power partically came to the hands of the Congress the people in British Orissa then side by side with political agitation, a movement for amalgamation of the native States within Orissa was started for the first time. The Koshal Utkal Praja Parishad then started a movement for the formation of a Union of the native States of Orissa with a view to prevent their merger with Orissa. Dr. Harekrushna Mahtab, the then Chief Minister of Orissa, with utmost humility appealed to the Rulers of Orissa to consider the question of integration of the princely States with Orissa and he agreed to all the conditons suggested by them. Still when these people did not agree to Dr. Mahtab's proposal Dr. Mahtab went to the length of appealing to them to allow British Orissa to join as a unit of the Eastern States Union which they wanted to form. The Parishad did not agree to this even, as they thought British Orissa will become the major party and would dominate. Today, however, these very people are talking of a mass movement for creation of greater Utkal. Sometimes some people are being swayed by them because others are busy with their own work. If anybody can be given the credit for creating the greater Utkal, it is those who were fighting with the British Government, it is those who have made the merger of the States with Orissa possible. If Seraikela and Kharswan was left out of Orissa then it was only because the Ruler of Seraikela and his friends had put obstacles. We are now claiming for the merger of Seraikela and Kharswan or Singhbhum not because the Rulers of Seraikela and Kharswan or Singhbhum were Oriyas but because the best interests of the common man in these areas demand the amalgamation of Singhbhum with Orissa. The argument that the ancient Utkal kingdom was extending from the Ganga to the Godavari has no longer any value for us.

We have ourselves broken this old history. We are now creating new history for the common man and it is for this reason that the States Reorganisation Commission was set up by the Government of India. But the old feudal class has been trying to perpetuate their own influence and attempting to recreate old history by all kinds of tricks. It is due to their misdirected agitation

that Seraikela was taken out of Orissa and amalgamated with Bihar. Thereafter, they cleverly tried to take the help of the Government of Orissa in order to get rid of the control of the Bihar Government. Their real intention was to evade the control of both Orissa and Bihar Governments and to regain their separate existence. But the Government of Orissa, instead of playing into their hands, helped the Government of India in teaching them a salutary lesson, with the result that they could not dupe any-body. Dr. Mahtab prevented this and that is why the frustrated group of people is repeatedly raking up this matter. If anybody thinks that by doing this Dr. Mahtab's reputation will be damaged, I would not agree with such a view. As I have said often it is due to the firmness of Dr. Mahtab that we were not duped by these tactics and that is why the integration of the Eastern States with Orissa was made pucca. Other princely States of India followed the example of Orissa and this led ultimately to the integration of all princely States in India. Just as by the earlier merger of Nilgiri with Orissa it had been demonstrated to all India that the integration of princily States was not only desirable but also posible, the integration of native States of Orissa led to the integration of all princely States in India with the Indian Union. In fact. in Orissa began the "Begining of the End". Those people who have been affected by this historical event have, no doubt, received an wound which will take time to heal. It is natural that until the wound fully heals up, they will show signs of mental distress. But what has happened in Orissa will go down in the history of India as a memorable incident for all ages. If these people had not agitated for the creation of a union of the Eastern States and if the Ruler of Seraikela had not behaved in the manner in which he did, the history of integration of these States in Orissa would have taken a different turn. 60 lakhs of people from the Eastern Stats were integrated with Orissa.. The circumstances under which Seraikela had to be taken away from Orissa are known to everybody. First the Ruler of Seraikela himself dug his own grave but when he realised that his own tricks would not succeed, he became anxious to bring back his State again to Orissa. He started a litigation for this and requested us to fight out his cause in the Supreme Court. For what purpose should we have helped him on that occasion ? Was it our intention to set aside the decision of the Government of India ? He left us and opted for Bihar after creating lots of agitation in Orissa. When he went over there he created further agitation to set aside the merger. How could that happen ? Was it for us to help him in his games ? Would it have been right for us to help him to set aside the act of merger whether with Bihar or with Orissa ? The Rulers had no idea of the Supreme Court. The Political Agent was for them the biggest judicial tribunal but the people who were out to create history in India and who had created the Supreme Court, could not have agreed to leave this issue for decision to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is not to decide with what State in India Seraikela should merge. That will be decided by the will of the people of India. But the Ruler of Seraikela made his own attempts. Whatever that may be, it was then decided that Seraikela will remain under the same administration with the district of Singhbhum. This was the decision then, and this was a reasonable decision then. Anybody who questions this decision will himself fall into a blunder. It is, therefore, clear on all hands, that until Singhbhum is merged with Orissa, any attempt to claim merger of Seraikela and Kharswan is fruitless. This question awaited decision of a body like the States Reorganisation Commission. This body had to decide the entire issue of merger of Singhbhum with Orissa and the question of the merger of Seraikela and Kharswan was only a corolary to that. But while the problem awaited solution and while all of us were busy with our own affairs, a group of self-interested people who had instigated the people of Seraikela and Kharswan to merge with Bihar, also attempted after their merger with Bihar to persuade them to agitate for reversion to Orissa. They raised public subscriptions and started mass movement for a demand for merger of Seraikela with Orissa. They did not understand the issues properly. They clouded just claims of Singhbhum for merger with Orissa. Thier agitation was only for merger of Seraikela and Kharswan. That is why I have always been maintaining that this demand for the merger of Seraikela and Kharswan with Orissa is just a political stunt like the outcry over the issue of Dalai Ghai. The result of this outcry was that all our memoranda and all the memoranda submitted by the Ganatantra Party, the Utkal Sammilani and all the facts of histroy were lost sight of. I may remind the House that when the demand for integration of princely States had not been there, when Pandit Gopabandhu Das was fighting for greater Utkal. was he fighting for Seraikela and Kharaswan ? Was the Utkal Sammilani then fighting for the issue of Seraikela and Kharaswan in their attempts ? Their claims were for the whole district of Singhbhum. But now as a result of the political outcry raised by the ex-Rulers, the issue become clouded and even the States Reorganisation Commission were misled by that outcry. Old history has no place here. We have to consider the realities of the situation. The Commission was in fact charged with this new responsibility. The report of the States Reorganisation Commission about Orissa has completely suprised me, but I have not become hopeless over this case. Anybody who reads the report of the States Reorganisation Commission will undoubtedly hold that the Commission has not taken into consideration our claims as presented before them. What they have stated to be our claim in their report is different from what was demanded in our memorandum. They have disposed of the case of Orissa while discussing the problems of Bihar. They first discussed the demands of other States on Bihar. The demand for the formation of Jharkhand predesh deserved to the carefully considered and they have done that. The Adibasis of Jharkhand were demanding a separate State like the people of Maharastra for a long time. During the British regime, nobody had given any attention to the Adibasi cause. Even during the regime of the native rulers, nobody gave any attention to the just demands of the Adibasis. It is only now that the Congress has formed a popular Government. The Country is now free and, therefore, the demands of Adibasi population are receiving sympathetic consideration. That is why they started a claim for a separate State. This demand was made even at the time

when the Constituent Assembly was in session. The States Reorganisation Commission have considered their claims from all angles. They have considered the arguments in favour of a Jharkhand State and the arguments against such a State and they have themselves carefully considered the merits and demerits of the case and have come to the conclusion that it is not desirable to create a separate State for the Adibasis. In the first place, the new State which the Adibasis have demanded would consist of a portion from the State of Bihar and a portion from the State of Orissa. The population living in this proposed new State will speak many different dialects. They have no cultural affinity with each other. On the whole, it was realised that if a separate Jharkhand is created, it will not be possible for it to serve the best interests of these Adibasis. That is why the Commission have rejected the case for creation of a separate Adibasi State.

After this they have come to the question of Seraikela and Kharswan. There they have stated that the controversy over Seraikela and Kharaswan is a recent one. From this alone, I feel they have not taken Orissa's demand to consideration at all. I feel that they have completely forgotton whatever impression they formed about the problem when they visited this State. They have probably lost whatever notes they had taken when they visited this State. Therefore at the time of writing the report they have not at all applied their mind to the case presented by Orissa. Otherwise, they would have first stated Orissa's demand correctly and then given their reasons for rejecting it. Our claim on Bihar was for the whole of Singhbhum district, more particularly for the Sadar subdivision of Singhbhum and Serai: kela. When our claim was for this whole district we had given all the arguments in favour of that. But they have, however, not gone into these basic arguments and have pronounced a judgement. If a judge gives a judgement without considering the issues raised by a plaintiff, the judgement becomes ab initio void. In such cases, a retrial is called for. The Commission have no where fully stated the claims of Orissa. Not only in the Chapter on Bihar but also when they have written the Chapter on Orissa, they have committed the same mistake. They have stated there also that Orissa's claim is mainly for Seraikela. The population of Singhbhum Sadr is 6,04,000 but, of Seraikela and Kharswan the population is only two lakhs. How can, therefore. it be said that our main claim is for Seraikela and Kharswan ? Any impartial observer who reads the report will say that the Commission has done an injustice.

But even if the Commission considered our claims for Seraikela and Kharswan alone. there they have not considered what are the reasons for our claims. They have said that our claims for Seraikela and Kharswan are recent. We have started our claim for Seraikela and Kharswan from the time when the question of merger arose. At what earlier date could we have started our claim for these areas ?

In the old days, nobody counted the Hos of Singhbhum. Singhbhum was called an Oriya area because there were more Oriyas than Biharis. But since we passed the resolution about our demand for the inclusion of outlying tracts we have become more wise because this is the first time that we are making a demand in Independent India, we have included the problems of Hos and other Adibasis in our memorandum. Anybody who knows the history of Mayurbhanj and who has read the Memorial submitted by the Maharaja of Mayurbhanj to Lord Mountbatten before the merger, will know the early history of the Hos and Kols. The problem of Hos and their opinion are most important. But the Commission have not said a word about them. They have merely said that since the population of Oriyas in Singhbhum district is 26%, therefore the claims of Orissa over Singhbhum cannot stand. Only because States Reorganisation Committee has rejected the claims of the Adibasis for a separate. Jharkhand State, we should not think that Chotanagpur has any linguistic affinity with Bihar. The Hon'ble Member from Satyabadi has already said that when a separate province for Orissa was being considered, there were serious discussions as to whether Chotanagpur should remain with Bihar or with Orissa. It was a matter of accident that Chotanagpur instead of merging with the separate province of Orissa, remained with Bihar. But if it is now argued that Bihar has acquired a prescriptive right over Chotanagpur merely because it was then decided that Chotanagpur should remain with Bihar that cannot constitute a reasonable argument. There is no cogent reason advanced why either Singhbhum Sadar or Seraikela or Kharswan should remain with Bihar. Whatever arguments have been advocated they are of a purely negative nature. While discussing the case of Dhalbhum, the arguments that weighed with them were that while there were sugar factories in the north, the coal fields were in Chotanagpur and that Jamshedpur had to remain in Bihar. It is on such grounds that the case for Jharkhand has been rejected. They have made out a case for keeping Dhalbhum in Bihar on similar consideration. I am not saying whether their decision is correct or not. But having decided to keep Dhalbhum with Bihar, they started giving negative arguments that since Dhalbhum must remain with Bihar, Seraikela and Kharswan could not come to Orissa because that would make Dhalbhum an enclave. All this mistake was the result of forgetting Orissa's claim on the lower tract (Singhbhum Sadar) link. They forgot our older demand for Singhbhum and they have not taken that at all into consideration. For reasons similar to those that weighed with them for retention of Dhalbhum in Bihar, Singhbhum should revert to Orissa. Moreover, Dhalbhum has no cultural affinity with Bihar. The number of Bengalis and Oriyas there is greater than that of Biharis. But the Commission has laid grater emphasis on the fact that Jamshedpur has long been under the Government of Bihar, that there is a steel factory there and that factory is getting lots of concession from the Bihar Government and therefore, they felt that Dhalbhum should remain with Bihar. Many of our prominent public had anticipated this. When the report was published the Maharaja of Patna told me that he had feared that the issue of Jamshedpur would create difficulties. This has come true.

My main contention is that the Commission has not considered the questions regarding Singbhum and Seraikela subdivisions properly. If they had taken our memoranda into considera-

tion, they would have certainly accepted our claims. All the memoranda which we had prepared and submitted till now could have been taken into consideration and if there were any arguments against them, those could have been stated. But till now no counter arguments have been advanced, nobody has shown any cogent reasons agaist our claims. Even the people of Bihar know and it is known to everybody that the Hindi speaking population in Singhbhum is in a minority. Besides, the Biharis, though they came to Sinhbhum long ago, have not yet established any cultural or social relations with the villagers of Singhbhum. The Adibasis of Singhbhum do not observe the social or religious festivals of the Biharis. The Biharis worship Lord Mahaveer, but none of the Adibasis in Singhbhum do worship Mahaveer. On the other hand, they follow the Oriya festivals. The Holi festival is the most important festival in Bihar and this is observed with tremendous enthusiasm. In Orissa no doubt, Abir is distributed during the Holi festivity, but we do not observe Holi festival very much in the villages. I dare say that in the towns of Singhbhum, Holi is probably observed in the same fashion as it is observed in our towns like Cuttack. But as in Orissa, the Holi festival is not observed with any ceremony in the rural areas of Singhbhum. Anybody who observes the cultural pattern, the festivities and the way of life of the Adibasis in Singhbhum will come to the conclusion that they have much greater affinities with Oriyas than with anybody else.

If Singhbhum subdivision is amalgamated with Orissa, no area retained in Bihar will become an enclave, nor will this cause any other administrative inconvenience to Bihar. Therefore, I submit that the Commission have not carefully Considered what should be the boundaries between Orissa and Bihar in this area. Of course I am not out to blame the Commission. They have not taken this into consideration because they have concentrated their attention on bigger problems. If there were any overriding reasons and if they had mentioned them, then we could understand that they have given the matter through consideration from all angles of vision. In my opinion, even if there were few Oriyas in Singhbhum, even if the people of Kolhan had not expressed their desire to amalgamate with the Hos living in Mayurbhanj and Keonjhar. even then Singhbhum should be amalgamated with Orissa in grounds and considerations similar to those that weighed with the Commission for retaining Dhalbhum in Bihar. The State of Orissa consists of 148,00,000 people. They should have considered how many miles of railways and what other facilities are in this State. If Singhbhum had been amalgamated with Orissa, Orissa could have got at least 2 fair sized Railway Stations and a few towns like Chakradharpur and Chaibasa. If statistics are examined regading the ratio of the rural and urban population of the whole of India, it will be seen that the percentage of the urban population is the lowest in Orissa, It may be 5 to 6 per cent of the total population. No other State in India is so undeveloped. The town of Chakradharpur adjoins our mining areas. The forests of Singhbhum are contiguous to the forests of Orissa and even from economic reasons, it is but desirable that this area should have been amalgamated with Orissa. We are starting a Steel Plant at Rourkella. If we could get a few more railway stations near Rourkella that will lead to quicker development of other industries in the region. The Singhbhum subdivision is surrounded by Orissa on three sides. On one side there is the district of Sundergarh, on another side Keonjhar and to the east is the district of Mayurbhanj. No consideration has been paid to these facts. In my oponion, if ample consideration is paid to there arguments, Singhbhum is bound to come to Orissa. Above all, this solution creates no inconvenience for any other State. Bihar has practically no relation with Singhbhum. When the question of Jharkhand was discussed, the Commission have expressed an opinion that the majority of the Adibasis are not in favour of Jharkhand though some 34 Adibasi members of the Bihar Assembly have pressed for the creation of Jharkhand. They have also said that the Jharkhand State would be a very poor State, that the Adibasis have not got a common language and so the creation of a Jharkhand State would benefit nobody. Whatever be the reasons for their rejecting the demand for Jharkhand they have certainly stated them very clearly. The Commission has referred to the views of the Sub-Committee of the Constituent Assembly on this matter of Jharkhand:—

(The Sub-Committee) "was of the view that tribal people should be associated adequately with all branches of administaration 'including the Cabinet' and that 'this tract must be dealt with not only by economic and educational improvements but also by remedies which recognise its political and psychological aspects."

No doubt, some of the Adibasis of Bihar who were fighting for a Jharkhand State are now for various reasons expressing an opinion that the Adibasi areas should remain in Bihar. But the majority of Adibasis are not at all happy there. One of the reasons is that they should have representatives in the Cabinet. I have had a discussion with Shri Jaipal Singh. It appears to me that the Adibasis do not want to remain in Bihar but their only hope is that if they stay in Bihar, it will facilitate their future claim for a Jharkhand State. They are now feeling that justice has not been done to them. One of the Adibasi communities are the Hos. I foresee their problem will, one day assume serious propo tions. Like the Khond lebellion, the Hos started a rebellion sometime ago. At that time they came to Mayurbhanj and started looting. Very often they come for looting. in the past some rulers or zamindars were inciting them against the neighbouring ruler or zamindar. These rulers or zamindars by inciting the Hos were themselves reaping certain advantages out of these rebellions. The Hos used to carry on raids in the neighbouring States. My friend, the Adibasi Minister, will kindly excuse me when I refer to this aspect of the problem. What is happening in Orissa today ? Let us look at the reserve forests of Orissa. The Adibasis have cut down the trees and have started settling. Hos from Singhbhum have come to Mayurbhanj. They have felled trees and have started cultivation. We are not at all attempting to drive them out of these settlements. Somehow we are trying to settle lands with them. We are trying in all respects to come to a working solution. This

is because the welfare of the Adibasis is one of our special responsibilities. The Adibasis are adept in reclaiming jungle land. In olden times it was the sign of civilisation to cut down the jungle and to reclaim the lands. That is why our Rishis of the Aryan days were advocating the burning of fuel in Homas and Jag Yagna. But times have changed now; there has been so much of denudation of forests that we are now inculcating the virtue of tree planting and celebrating Vano-mohotsav. But nevertheless we are not punishing the Adibasis who are destroying our jungles. We are trying to give them lands but they are still a problem for us. The Hos of Singhbhum are unable to stay in Bihar and they will always come and create troubles for us. But if this area is given to us, we would try to tackle their problems by starting new small-scale or cottage industries in that area because otherwise they will be a headache for us in other areas. Thus even from the adminstrative point of view, the district of Singhbhum needs to be amalgamated with Orissa, otherwise no other State would be able to solve their problems. The Hos can only live in Orissa because there is a very large number of Hos in Orissa. Now-a-days we are stressing the value of social anthropology. This is a comparatively new science and provides for a new approach. The Government of India have got advisers on Anthropology like Mr. Elwin and Dr. Dutta Majumdar. Let somebody study this problem of the Hos. We are talking of integration of Indian culture, but I don't think that in any other State in India, there has been so much complete integration of culture beginning from the Adibasi right up to the Brahmin as we find in Orissa. In most other States the Brahmins stand apart from the other castes and live a segregated life and other states have a non-Brahmin movement. But nowhere such an integrated culture is in existence as in Orissa which embraces all castes from Adibasi to the Brahmin and this extends to important functions like marriage ceremonies. It may be said that in village where the Adibasis are in a majority others take to their custom out of fear for them. But in Orissa, even where the number of Adibasis is less than one per cent so that you hardly notice their existence the integration is noticeable. For example, in Brahmin villages and in Sasan villages of the district of Puri, no auspicious or religious ceremony is observed in the village unless the village deity is worshipped. This village deity is again a deity not with Brahmin priests but priests like the village barber woman if not an Adibasi. This deity is accessible to all castes and unless this deity is first worshipped the Vedic ceremony cannot be performed. Here we find a real integration of the Adibasi and Brahmin culture. I do not think anywhere in India this kind of thing exists. I had been to Bardoli in the west coast. There these Adibasis number 80 to 90 per cent. The other population is in a minority There I have seen under the shade of a tree earthen horses are being vorshipped with green and red threads tied round them like spider's web just like what we find in our village. But nobody other than the Adibasis worship these deities. I have asked others, the caste people but they have said that these deities are for the Adibasis only. No other castes have anything to do with these deities. You will realise that all our talk about cultural integration or cultural synthesis in India has real existence only in Orissa at the present moment and I trust the Government of India will not permit this to be lost. The same customs that pervail in Singhbhum or Seraikela also prevail not only in Mayurbhanj, but also in the district of puri: Jagannath and the cult of 'Jagannath' may be at the root of this kind of synthesis. Lord Jagannath was the deity of the Savaras. Originally, the Adibasis were in a majority in these parts. The others though they could not completely accept the Adibasi religious practices, put some dashes and dots, i. e. accepted them with some changes and adaptations. Thus a real integration of these practices with the Vedic rites was made possible. This new affinity which they created, is really a valuable thing. We do not find this to such an extent anywhere as in Orissa. You will find this in the State of Orissa and in some other places like Singhbhum and if we amalgamate them, we could at least make the best use of this already achieved integration of cultures. At any rate we could atleast preserve this valuable thing. Is there any other State in India where a Minister with a status higher than the Chief Secretary or the Commissioner takes pleasure in engaging himself and his wife in community dances with women labourers hailing from distant places like Chainabasa, who have come to the New Capital to earn wages ? Where, else can such things happen ? It is only in Orissa that this could be possible. Is it for political reasons that these things are happening ? It will be a mistake to think like that. In the State of Orissa, from ancient times, the Raja of Orissa has been sweeping the cars of Lord Jagannath at the time of the Car Festival. Can it be said that this has been done only on political grounds ? That can never be the case. The real answer is that under the force of circumstances a cultural synthesis had been created in Orissa which has been deformed and damaged by rajas, rulers, zamindars and the British Government oppression and poverty have done their work.

My contention is that the Government of India are already considering all these border questions and they will certainly consider everything before a Bill is drafted. My only request to them is that they should very thoroughly go into every detail of this body of arguments. If there are doubts, let them consult experienced men. The Oriyas of Singhbhum live scattered in all the villages in perfect harmony with the Adibasi population. This has been used as an argument against them by the States Reorganisation Commission. But if, on the other hand, the Oriyas of Singhbhum instead of remaining scattered throughout the whole district were all concentrated in one place as the Biharis have done at Jamshedpur, that would not prove that Oriyas have affinity or close social ties with the Adibasis of Singhbhum. If we found the Oriyas concentrated in the town of Seraikela because it happened to be headquarters of the Oriya Ruler, will that have made Orissa's claim on Singhbhum stronger even on the town of Seraikela ? The Oriyas of Singhbhum are remaining scattered because that is the pattern of society obtaining in Singhbhum with which

no other population could have adjusted themselves so easily as to remain in such a scattered way thoughout the district. Shri Sunaram Soren has already explained this aspect of the problem very clearly and I fervently hope that it will be fully gone into before a decision is arrived at.

Next I would come to the question of Chotanagpur. The Commission have ruled out the question of Jharkhand. It is said that unless Singhbhum remains with Chotanagpur, the Adibasis will feel aggrieved. It is also argued that when Shri Jaipal Singh is claiming a new State like Jharkhand it would not be proper to dismember the existing Chotanagpur area. My point is that this is a recent stand. I would refer to an earlier stand of the Adibasi leaders that in case Jharkhand was not possible, thay would not tolerate any principal tribe to be dismembered. It is then not a question of dismemberment of geographical areas. The main question before us now is the dismemberment of the Ho tribe. Our contention is that let all the Hos remain under one administration and the arguments that are being put forward against this contention have no relevancy to this aspect of the problem. Shri Jaipal Sing is a man of Ranchi. He is not a representative of the Hos. Sidu Hembrom who was a representative from Singhbhum was the Leader of the Opposition of the Bihar Assembly. He and other Ho leaders of Singhbhum have already given a memorandum. We have to consider the reasons put forth by the Hos in their separate memoranda.

It has been argued that if the whole of the district of Singhbhum could be added to Orissa, the matter could be considered. But since the O'Donnell Committee did not approve of this merger, the question is ruled out. While discussing the opinion of the O'Donnell Committee we are forgetting the circumstances under which they came to such a conclusion. We are forgetting that the O'Donnell Committee gave the greatest possible stress on the opinion of the Hos, and if the Hos have submitted a memorandum demanding amalgamation with Orissa, then the whole finding of the O'Donnell Committee has to be read in a new lignt but the States Reorganisation Commission has not considered the problem of the Hos at all. It is from this angle of vision that this problem deserves a full reconsideration and I am glad that reconsideration is being done. My only submission is that while reconsidering the whole question, if there is any doubt anywhere, let the opinion of the sepecialists and experienced people be taken. It is known everywhere that if some litigation statrs over a trifling piece of land, it takes a long time to be settled and although the States Reorganisation Commission have disposed of bigger issues on general considerations yet it may not be proper to summarily dispose of the smaller issues without giving these issues the consideration that they deserve. These problems are no doubt of minor significance, but they are not matters to be disposed of in a hurry. The question of refixation of boundaries has to be very carefully gone into and it has to be done with patience after consideration of all the pros and cons.

Of course, I must confess that we ourselves are not free from blame. Our problem is not of the same magnitude as of Maharastra. Their problem of reorganisation involves bigger questions as to whether Vidarbha will form part of greater Maharastra or whether Bombay will be inside or outside Maharastra. Ours is a smaller problem. Our boundaries have not yet been correctly fixed and we request that they may be fixed correctly now. This is our claims but we are getting unnecessarily excited in imitation of what the Maharastrians are doing. The circumstances which obtained when our previous boundaries were fixed are no longer present. There is now a new map of Orissa as a result of the integration of the Eastern States. We have to refix Orissa's boundary according to the new map and take into account the circumstances now obtaining. Hence these considerations requires long and time-taking deliberations. If in our hurry for reorganisation of States, these questions are decided against the best interests of Orissa then this will clearly amount to injustice to Orissa. There will be greater injustice done towards the people living in these adjoining areas.

Although I hold distinct views on this subject, I have never exercised my mind on it. So many men are engaged in this work. There are too many problems facing us in new India. Every body is free today to pursue any problem that attracts his mind. When we were fighting against the British Government, there were still many people in this country who did not consider even that to be an important problem. Today there are many other problems facing us, how equal opportunities will be available to all our people, how the poorer sections will not be oppressed, how the landless people will be given lands. These are according to us bigger problems and some of us are engaged in solving them. But we realise that unless these problems sink down to the minds of the common people, nothing can be achieved. A correct adjustment of boundaries is important only to the extent to which it contributes to the more important problems enumerated above. The problem of poverty, the problem of landless workers, the problems of inequalities of income are the main problems facing our new regime. The problem of rectification of boundaries is a minor problem and is important only to the extent to which it contributes to the bigger issues. If the Oriyas and Hos live together under Orissa we can solve the bigger issues much more easily. If we do not consider the whole aspect from this angle and simply are swayed by feudal sentiments that we are losing such and such teritories, we will miss the main issue. I am afraid this feudal mentality is getting too much of a hold on our minds. We talk as if somebody is taking away our own territory. One of the Hon'ble Members has argued that when we got the district of Koraput we had got a territory of so many thousands of square miles, but when we actually check-measured the area was found to be less. Are we engaged in transactions of selling or buying lands ? Is there any cogent reason that if we had got a piece of territory within our State it should always remain with us ? The Andhras are arguing that in the district of Koraput there are more Andhras than Oriyas. The sothrern bondaries of Orissa had once been determined. No change has taken place in our map on that side. So if the question is reopened, it is quite possible we may get a few more villages and lose a few others. Some arguments that appeal to us may not appeal to others. Since the olden days of the Rajas and

Rulers people had been kept under such coditions that people of one area would not like to go to another area and if any such things happened, it was leading to tremendous consequences. Under the new conditions we should not have or encourage any such mentality. In the Anchal Administration in this very State, we have also noticed the same mentality. If some village of Ranpur area is added to some other area, this leads to a lot of agitation. If a few villages of Hindol are being tagged to some other Anchal, everybody gets agitated. But do we realise that such a big State like Hyderabad is now going to be divided into several States ? Three years ago, nobody ever conceived of such a possibility and when such big States like Hyderabad are being divided, why should we stick to our old feudal ideas which are being fanned by the Rulers, and Zamindars. There are many Rajas amongst us who have very little property. They live under thatched sheds and are indebted to the Marwaris. Even then they are creating the fedudal mentality. We have to be careful about them. What the States Reorganisation Commission are going to do at the national level, we will also have to do at our States level. But we should not be excited over that as well as over this. Once we get excited we fall into errors. Seraikala had merged with Orissa and was taken away. That was so because the movement for merger and remerger was wrongly directed by the Rulers with feudal mentality, and as one of the leaders of Singbhum, Shri Kahnu Kishore Pani, has said it is on account of the feudal outcry over Seraikela that our demand for Singhbhum has been overshadowed. I may mention here that many eminent persons of Singhbhum had become the Presidents of the Utkal Sammelani. If the Government of India would enquire, they can find out how many Oriya and non-Oriya doctors, Deputy Magistrates, Engineers, and other officers belonging to Singhbhum district are serving under the Bihar Government, how many from that area are studying in the different colleges of Bihar. The fact is that the people of Singhbhum are connected with Orissa in every field and are serving under the Orissa Government in different departments. It cannot be said that these posts have been given to them only to show to the States Reorganisation Commission. They have been serving in Orissa for a long time.

Now coming to the question of Bastar and other adjoining areas on the Madhya Pradesh side, the Commission's findings are a matter of regret. They have not gone into the details of the question regarding Bastar. That is why Bastar has been left where it was. They were naturally busy deciding details about the reorganisation of Bombay and about how the Karnatak State will be formed with Mysore, etc. They recommended the formation of new States wherever they considered it necessary. That is how the State of Kerala has been recommended. But they were not able to give sufficient attention to the problems of the old States which have been left in tac. They have not adequately considered why Bastar should not come to Orissa and should continue in Madhya Pradesh. Like the creation of the elephant by Brahma, they have recommended the creation of Madhya Pradesh as a result of which it spread from the East coast to the West coast. But still they did not find it possible to give the adjoining Oriya majority treats near the Orissa border to Orissa. Nor have they given any thought to the problems of the Adibasis in those areas. Though the Koyas and some other tribes are to be found in Koraput (Orissa) and the adjoining areas of Madhya Pradesh, the Commission has not tought fit to bring them together. Form the stand-point of administration, is it convenient to keep these people under several States ? I have no doubt that they have not applied their mind to these questions of details. We have cited the case of the small Sankara tract as a proof of this fact. If they had applied their mind they could not have possibly overlooked this obivious anomaly. If the question of the refixation of Orissa's boundary on the Madhya Pradesh side is considered in detail, I have no doubt that some of the adjoining areas will be included in Orissa.

I wish to make one thing very clear before resuming my seat. That is whatever decision is taken after a careful consideration of the questions there will be no disorder in Orissa. I have had the occasion to meet gatherings of thousands even when the so-called symbolic protest of burning the Report was being staged at Cuttack. I have not noticed any sign of disorder or serious unrest over this issue. I am sure there will be no breaking of heads in Orissa over it. But I must say with all the emphasis that I can command that it is a very serious question for the people of the adjoinging areas who have got linguistic and cultural affinity with Orissa. If the Government of India desire uniform progress throughout the country, if we want really to have a socialistic pattern of society, then the boundary of Orissa should be redrawn after a very careful consideration of the interests of these people in the border areas of Bihar and Madhya Pradesh.

There has been some attempts to cross-examine us on the question of our southern boundry. Though nothing has happened to change the situation in any way since this boundary was fixed by the O'Donnell Committee, it is a fact that there are a few Oriya villages on the other side and similar claim is made by Andhra on a few villages on our side, But it is not at all a serious dispute. If both the States agree this matter can be settled easily by negotiation because each of us may hope to gain something from the other. It may be they may get a little less and we may get a little more. But there is no serious gain or loss on either side. Therefore, there is no reason to get excited over this matter. That is why we are pressing mainly for two things:—

(1) For the rectification of our common boundary with Bihar, and

(2) for the same with regard to Madhya Pradesh.

I have no doubt that if our claims receive careful consideration we would get along with Singhbhum and Seraikela, Bastar, Phuljhar and some other portions of Madhya Pradesh.

Mr. SPEAKER : There are now seven amendments, out of them 2nd, 3rd and the 6th are of identical nature. They will be treated as one. Amendments Nos. 1, 4, 5 and 7 will be taken up separately.

Mr. SPEAKER : The original motion moved was the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission be taken into consideration to which an amendment was moved that at the end of the motion add "after consulting the Report this

Assembly is strongly of the opinion that Seraikela and Sadar subdivision of Singhbhum and Bahadagad police-station of Dhalbhum subdivision of Singhbhum district in Bihar, Seraipalli, Basna, Mainpur and Deobhog police-stations in Raipur district and whole of Bastar district in Madhya Pradesh, Ichhapuram Tahsil including 60 Oriya villages of Udayana-khanda, Dubarsingh, Jalantar, Mandasa, Tarala, Tikkali and portions of the Zamindaries of Chikati and Parlakimedi in Anchara, Parvatipuram, Salur and Palkonda agencies of Srikakulam district, Sujankotta Mutha, Gangaraj Madgol, Paderu, Arakku, Viravalli and Srungavarapu Kota agencies in Vishakhapatnam district of Andhra be included in the State of Orissa".

Now the question is that the amendment be accepted by the House.

The House divided as follows:—

Ayes—13 Noes—49

The amendment was lost.

Mr. SPEAKER : Another amendment was moved that at the end of the motion add "and the Parliament be urged upon to accept the demands put forth in the memoranda submitted by the State Government to the States Reorganisation Commission in full inspite of the recommendations of the said Commission to the contrary".

Now the question is that the amendment be accepted by the House.

The amendment was lost.

Shri GODAVARIS MISRA : Sir, I want to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER : Has the Hon'ble Member the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment ?

The amendment, with the leave of the House was withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Another amendment was moved that at the end of the motion add "after due consideration of the Report this House welcomes the abolition of the Rajpramukhas and Part 'C' States and welcomes the formatidns of certain new provinces. This House however highly deplores the fact that the States Reorganisation Commission has not accepted the cardinal principle of linguistic homogeneity as the basis for the formation of the States and adjustment in boundaries.

This House rejects the States Reorganisation Commission Report as far as it concerns Orissa.

It is recommends to the Government of India for the inclusion of Sadar subdivision and Seraikela subdivision of Singhbhum district of Bihar and further rcommends the readjustment of Orissa's western and southern bondaries on the basis of linguisitc majority and contiguity taking village as the unit".

The question is that the amendment be accepted by the House.

The amendments was lost.

Mr. SPEAKER : The question is that at the end of the motion add "while appreciating and accepting broadly the general principles on which the States Reorganisation Commission have passed their recommendations in their report for the solidarity and National Unity of India, such as

(1) One class of States in the whole country.

(2) Abolition of the office of Rajpramukhs,

(3) Safeguards for protecting the interests of linguistic minorities.

This Assembly notes with deep regret and disappointment that the Commission has completely ignored the claims of Orissa so far as the readjustment of its bondaries is concerned. A perusal of the recommendations revelas that the Commission have not given any consideration to the facts and arguments advanced by State Government in their Memoranda in regard to this matter.

"This Assembly, therefore, urges uopn the Government of India to review the recommendations of the Commission in the light of the just and legitimate claims put forth by the State Government in their memoranda and take such measures as are necessary to readjust the boundaries of the Orissa State so as to integrate with it the areas claimed, particularly, the Sadar and Seraikela subdivisions of the Singhbhum district in Bihar, the Phuljhar Jamindary Area (Mahasamund Tahsil A), Bindra-Nuagarh (Deobhog), Sankara tract and four Tahsils of Bastar, namely, Jagadalpur, Kondgan, Dantewara and Konta in Madhya Predesh."

The amendment was accepted.

Mr. SPEAKER : Now the question is "The Report of the States Reorganisation Commission be taken into consideration.

While appreciating and accepting broadly the general principles on which the States Reorganisation Commission have passed their recommendations in their report for the solidarity and National Unity of India, such as—

(1) One class of States in the whole country

(2) Abolition of the office of Rajpramukhs,

(3) Safeguards for protecting the interests of linguistic minorities, this Assembly notes with deep regret and disappointment that the Commission has completely ignored the claims of Orissa so far as the readjustment of its boundaries is concerned. A perusal of the recommendations reveals that the Commission have not given any consideration to the facts and arguments advanced by the State Government in their memoranda in regard to this matter.

"This Assembly, therefore, urges upon the Government of India to review the recommendations of the Commission in the light of the just and legitimate claims put forth by the State Government in their memoranda and take such measures as are necessary to readjust the boundaries of the Orissa State so as to intergrate with it the areas claimed, particularly, the Sadar and Sareikala subdivisions of the Singbhum district in Bihar, the Phuljhar Jamindary Area (Mahasamund Tahsil A), Bindhra-Nuagarh (Deobhog), Sankara tract and four tahasils of Bastar, namely Jagadalpur, Kondagan, Dantewara and Konta in Madhya Pradesh".

The motion was adopted

———

AUTHORITATIVE RECORDS ON THE MERGER OF ORISSA STATES WITH THE PROVINCE OF ORISSA.

Secret memorandum submitted by the Government of Orissa on December 11, 1947 when Dr. Harekrishna Mahtab was the Chief Minister. He did not suggest merger. He wanted some administrative arrangements between Orissa Province and Orissa States.

"SECRET

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF ORISSA ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL FUTURE OF ORISSA STATES

We have taken into consideration the minutes of the informal meeting held at Delhi on the 20th November 1947, which was attended among others by the Prime Minister of Orissa, to discuss the constitutional future of the Orissa States. We have given the subject matter the close attention that its importance demands, and the following are our considered views and unanimous recommendations:—

2. The two main points which were left over at the Delhi meeting for further consideration in consultation with the Government of Orissa are—

(a) the quantum of subjects on which the States—particularly B and C Class States—should be asked to accede in order that powers and functions in respect of these subjects can be delegated to the Government of Orissa; and

(b) the question of financial contribution to be made by the acceding States to Orissa for the administration of the ceded subjects.

3. With regard to the first question, two alternatives appear to have been tentatively discussed at the Delhi meeting, namely, delegation to the Government of Orissa of either—

(i) a specified number of provincial subjects such as those in respect of which the Prime Minister of Orissa has been pressing for a common administration in Orissa and Orissa States: or

(ii) all subjects in the provincial legislative list of the Government of India Act, 1935, with the exception of land revenue.

We consider it necessary to take a somewhat comprehensive view of administration in States which will naturally cover not only the subjects in the provincial legislative list but those in the federal legislative list and the concurrent legislative list as well. In respect of three subjects, viz., defence (including such alied matters as arms, ammunition and explosives), external affairs, and communications, all States are expected to accede to the Dominion; and B and C Class States will be required to accede in regard to civil and criminal jurisdiction as well. There would then remain, excluding these subjects and excluding the entire range of provincial subjects, quite a number of matters for which a State must make administrative arrangements such as (in the federal field) currency and legal tender; census; air navigstion: opium; banking; customs; income-tax, salt, etc—in addition to the subjects included in the concurrent list such as factories, labour welfare, trade union, etc. We have no administrative machinery for central subjects and cannot in any case take them over. The Centre can take them over by agreement or through supplementary Instruments of Accession. If they do not take them over completely, some subjects will be left with the States. If again in the provincial sphere the province takes over the administration of only some subjects but not all, a number of provincial subjects would be left with the States. In that case administration in the States will be three-tiered.

(a) The Dominion Government or their agents will administer certain subjects.

(b) the State itself will administer certain other subjects both in the provincial as well as in the federal spheres: and

(c) the Provincial Government will administer certain other specified subjects in the provincial field.

4. Administrative arrangements must, of course, follow the constitutional set up; e. g., the three-tier administration visualised above postulates a three-tier constitution. We have no knowledge what the constitutional set up in the States will be; but we consider that by far the simplest and most ideal arrangement would be for all States—

(a) to accede to the Dominion in all matters covered by the list of federal subjects, and

(b) to accede with the permission of the Dominion Government to the province of Orissa in all matters covered by the provincial and concurrent lists—constitutional provision being made for the Rules' privy purses and allied matters.

In that case popular representiatives from States would sit both in the Dominion legislature and in the Provincial legislature, Provincial administration would be common for the Orissa province and the Orissa States; and the executive authority of the province in all branches will extend to the States. Accession of States to a province in respect of provincial matters is, however, not possible under the Government of India Act, 1935. A State can accede to the Dominion only or make over powers and functions to the Dominion Government by agreement; and so far provin cial subjects are concerned, the Dominion Government can make them over to the Provincial Govern ment for administration under section 124. Legislative authority cannot naturally be delegated, and therefore the Dominion Parliament would be the legislative authority in respect of all matters—Central and Provincial—delegated by the States. In administering provincial subjects in the States, the province will be responsible not to the Orissa legislature but to the Dominion Government. Under the present constitutional setup, therefore the people of the States or their representatives cannot be invested with legislative authority if the province takes over the administration of the States in the provincial sphere. This is a position which cannot naturally be regarded as satisfactory and can be accepted only as an interim arrangement pending provision of direct accession of States to provinces by revision of the present constitution. Under the interim arrangement, association of the people of the States can be secured by the formation of popular advisory councils, and the convention can be established that the councils will be consulted and their advice will as far as possible, be accepted in all matters relating to States administration. Such councils would, however, be purley advisory bodies

and would have no statutory powers or authority.

We have assumed above that the now constitution new before the Constituent Assembly will provide for the direct accession of States to neighbouring provinces (with, of course, the permission of the Dominion Government) in respect of all provincial subjects. In any case we strongly recommend that such a provision should be made and the constitutional consequences of accession to a province should be clearly laid down, including the consequence that such an acceding State would, for purposes of returning members to the provincial legislature, be regarded as a part of the province. We understand that the draft Union and Provincial constitutions which have been tentatively approved by the Constituent Assembly merely provide for a common administration in provinces and neighbouring States with the agreement of their Rulers. But that in our view is clearly not enough as it leaves out of accounts the people of the States and would not secure their representation in the provincial legislature. We can see no constitutional impropriety in a statutory provision for direct accession of States to provinces in respect of provincial subjects with the consent of the Dominion Government but if it is held that such a provision would for any reason be improper, we suggest that some means should be provided in the new constitution whereby a province may acquire legislative (and not merly executive) authority in its neighbouring States, with, of courses the necessary corollary that for purposes of election to the provincial legislature the States would be regarded as an integral part of the province. We, further, suggest that the constitution should make it clear beyond doubt that such complete amalgamation of States with a province would, once made, be final and irrevocable.

5. Assuming for the moment that administration of certain subjects will be left with the States either for some time or indefinitely, it is necessary to consider what will be the constitutional authority in the States. Personal rule by Ruling Chiefs can probably be ruled out altogether; it will suit none except probably the Rulers themselves and even that is doubtful. Recent events have made it clear beyond doubt that the States people will not tolerate autocratic rule in any circumstances even in a limited sphere. Left to themselves, they would overthrow it: and we must proceed on the assumption that unlike the late British Government who are interested in the continuance of personal rule by petty Chieftains (though under very strict control), the Dominion Government would not think of imposing and protecting (if necessary by force) autocratic rule even in comparatively unimportant matters against the declared will of the people.

It does not appear to us also that responsible Ministries can be expected to function successfully in individual States, B and C Class States cannot obviously bear overhead charges of separate legislatures, separate executives and separate administrative staffs. It is doubtful if even A Class States can do so with the probable exception of Mayurbhanj. (We doubt also if rule by local representatives of individual States even in matters of local concern would be an improvement on or be more efficient than personal rule of Ruling Chiefs.

One the whole it would thus appear that if the States are to have any kind of separate constitutional entity at all, they must unite for the purpose but with democratic Governments at the Centre and in the provinces the Union will naturally have to be a union of the States peoples and not of the Ruling Chiefs. We have fully discussed the feasibility of such a union (even for limited purposes) later in this memorandum; and we have been compelled to reject any such plan as impracticable and incase completely useles .

6. In our view the essential defect in the States' Ministry's suggestion that it would be wise to adopt a gradual policy of integration lies in the fact that it leaves the question unanswered as to what would be the constitutional authority in the States to administer those subjects which would not be taken over by the Province. From all points of view it would seem to be better and wiser to take a long range view of the problem so that any immedia te or interim arrangements that may now be made may be abiding in the sense that they could with perhaps minor adjustments, be readily fitted in the permanent constitutional scheme that may later on he devised for the administration of the States. The parties that have to be reckoned with are, (a) the Rulers, (b) the people of the States (c) the provincial administration in Orissa and (d)the Dominion Government. The recent serious disturbances in the States have perhaps convienced the Rulers that it is futile for them to try to continue any from of personal rule. They have perhaps realised that the British were the real masters in the States as much as in the provinces and that the only point on which the States differed from the provinces prior to the departure of the British was that whereas some form of constituentional and responsible Government was being gradually evolved in the provinces, the States remained all along under autocratic rule, partly of the Ruling Chiefs but mainly of the British masters of the country. So long this personal rule of Rulling Chiefs was supported and propped up by the paramount British power which in turn kept them straight. Lapse of British paramountecy has produced two-fold consequences. On theone hand, the Rulers are now free from the strict but necessary control which the late Political Department used to exercise over them. On the other hand, the prop of the British bayonet is gone, and the Rulers have now to reckon with the people and the rising tide of democracy in their States. Recent happenings have demonstrated beyond any doubt that with the prop gone, the Rulers are not even able to provide strong administration in the States and are helpless in the face of organized lawlessness on a mass scale. Democratisation of the States sooner or later is thus inevitable: and it is perhaps natural that democratic Governments in India will do nothing to retard the process, on th econtrary, their ideological and even active sympathy will probably be always on the side of the people. In these circumstances it would not perhaps be unrealistic to proceed on the assumption that the Ruling Chiefs would be satisfied if their dyanstic succession and privy purses and possibly certain personal prerogatives are guaranteed by the constitution.

The people of the States are definitely in favour of the immediate introduction of a democratic form of Government, though theire is somo reason to believe that they are divided on the issue of complete amalgamation with Orissa. Some, perhaps the majority, would prefer absorption in

the Province of Orissa, while others would prefer, at least partially, a separate political and economic existence.

The position of the Government of Orissa is briefly as follows. They are not anxious to absorb the States, but they are vitally concerned in their efficient administration at least in the sphere of law and order. They cannot, e. g., afford to have a mass rising of aboriginals in the States with the ever present danger of its spreading to aboriginal areas of the province; they cannot contemplate with equanimity political offenders and criminals seeking refuge in the so-called "sovereign" States; nor again the growth and consolidation of subversive movements in them; they cannot regard as satisfactory any constitutional arrangement under which their vital links of communication would be under a constant threat of being cut off or the condition of the public health in the province would be constantly endangered by primitive medical and public helath arrangments in the States, or their excise policy rendered ineffective by selfish and short signed policy in the States. From their point of view Orissa and Orissa States are parts of one greater whole indissolubly linked by natural and traditional ties of trade and commerce and social and cultural intercourse. They are convinced that neither part prosper unless the other does, So far the Orissa States have made no contribution to the common development of the province in any sphere, whereas States subjects have had unrestricted opportunities of public service and of employment and have enjoyed all educational, medical and other facilities available in Orissa province. It is almost certain that public opinion in the province would not tolerate continuance of all this material contribution to the people of the States solely at the expense of the province and would before long insist on either a suitable return for them or their termination.

There is finally the Dominion Government who are interested in the internal security of the country as a whole and its co-ordinated and orderly development along correct lines. It would perhaps be readily conceded that the Dominion Government as the dominant power in India is now the natural successor of the late Paramount Power in relation at least to all but the very biggest States, for, paramountcy is after all not a question of law but one of fact. We have no doubt that whether a State accedes or not. circumstances will force the Dominion Government to intervene in its affairs should it develop anarchy or misrule.

7. Once it is conceded first that autocratic and personal rule by Ruling Chiefs is now outomoded and must be eliminated and secondly that individual States cannot be run as autonomous units of the Indian Union, the constitutional issue becomes clearer. So far as the federal subjects are concerned, there is no reason at all why the States should not accede to the Dominion in respect of all of them without any exception; for unless they do so, the people of the States would enjoy a larger measure of local self-Government than the people of the provinces, which is, of course, unthinkable and which can not be justified on any ground. It would then follow that the executive and legislative authority that would be left with the States would be completely identical with the scope of provincial administration. In other words, the subjects that would be left for local administration in the States would be only the provincial subjects and the subjects in the concurrent list. The possible constitutional schemes for the administration of these subjects would appear to be—

(i) constitution of a separate province;
(ii) constitution of a sub-province;
(iii) complete amalgamation with Orissa and
(iv) partial integration with Orissa.

For (i) there is clearly no need and no justification; we do not think tht the States people are anxious for this development either. Financially it is impracticable since the total revenue of all the States is just over a crore of rupees including revenue from central sources of income. If revenue from the Central sources is omitted and if generous allowances are made for the Rulers' prive purses, the net revenue that will be left will be entirely inadequate for the bare needs of a provincial administration; and certainly nothing at all will be left for development of the new province.

8. In our view partial integration with the Province of Orissa is not a practical proposition either. For it will even then be necessary to set up a separate administration with a separate legislature, a separate executive and a separate administrative staff to administer those subjects which will not be administered in common with Orissa. In other words, partial integration with Orissa will involve the setting up of more or less the same constitutional and administrative paraphernalia as the creation of a separate province will, while the resources of a partially integrated administration will be a good deal less than those of a separate province, allowing for contributions for the administration of common subjects. Above all administrative difficulties involved in partial integration will be grave. Provincial administration is in reality indivisible. An injudicious and oppressive agrarian policy in one part of the province will have its repercussions on the law and order position in the entire province, and it will be idle to argue that the possition must be faced, because agrarian policy is not a matter of common concern. Moreover, administrative staff is, to a large extent, common for many subjects, e. g. the superior revenue staff in the provinces consists practically of the same body of officials as the magistracy. To duplicate the staff would be both expensive and unnecessary. We are thus unable to support wholeheartedly either of the two alternative suggestions which were made at the Delhi conference, that is, either that a specified number of selected subjects should be made over to the province for administration or even that all functions in the provincial sphere shold be delegated to the Provincial Government with the exception of land revenue which includes assessment and collection of revenue, survey and settlement, and preparation and maintenance of land records. It goes without saying that no collecting staff would be able to collect land revenue or any revenue unless it has the necessary backing of the ploice and the magistracy. On the other hands it would be unreasonable and unrealistic to assume that the Provincial Government's forces of law and order operating in States will in all circumstances enforce collections based on principles for which they have no sympathy and to which they may even be entirely opposed. It may, however, be that what the States Ministry had in mind in putting forward the suggestion that land revenue should be excepted from the ranges of subjects to

be made over to the Provincial Government for administration was that the Ruling Chiefs would be reduced to the position of Zamindars, and that while the Province would get from them fixed amounts of land revenue, it should be left to them to collect rents from their tenants, it being understood that it would be for the provincial Government to lay down the land revenue policy and to prescribe the modes and limits of assessment and collction. If that is the contemplated arrangement, we are unable to acquiesee in it either. It would result in our creating a new body of zamindars while we are pledged to the policy of abolition of zamindaries elsewhere in the province. In any case we are convinced that a diarchical system of Government in the States and division of administration provincial subjects between two authorities independent of each other would be difficult to work, if not altogether impossible.

9. We are then left with the two alternatives of (a) complete amalgamation with Orissa and (b) the creation of a sub-province. We are not convinced that there is adequate justification for a sub-province comprising of the areas which now form the Orissa States or that the resources of those areas or of the province as a whole are enough to support such a constitutional and admiministrative arrangement. A sub-province which postulates a separate legislature and a separate executive (under a common constitutional head) can be justified only where within the province there are distinct racial or linguistic area. Both in Orissa and in the Orissa States, however, Oriya is the common language (barring a number of aboriginal dialects in both parts) and the people are Oriyas excepting the aboriginals who exist though in a varying degree, both in the Orisse province and in the Orissa States. The only factors which can be said to distinguish the two parts are these—

(i) Orissa States are not properly developed. They mainly consist of hilly areas and are sparsely populated. To the common pool Orissa States would contribute proportionately a good deal less than the Orissa province;

(ii) political traditions in Orissa States are different and their administrative standards are a good deal lower:

(iii) the existence of a Princely Order in the States; and

(iv) finally, the fact that the aboriginal population in the States is proportionately larger than that in the Orissa province.

A mere recital of these factors should convince anybody that while the people of Orissa States have nothing to loss by their complete amalgamation with the province of Orissa, the people of the province can rightly apprehend that the amalgamation would, instead of benefiting them in any way, drag them down to a lower economic level. We have, however, reasons to believe that mainly for sentimental reasons and in consideration of the natural ties that link the two parts, the public of the province would not be opposed to the idea of amalgamation. Our advocacy of a complete amalgamation is further based on the practical considerations—

(a) that the accession of the States to the province would sesult in a lowering of the overhead charges of administration per head of population of the expanded province, and

(b) that after the Orissa States—particularly their mineral and forest resources—are adequately developed, these areas would be in a position to make adequate contributions to the common financial pool.

We are, of course, fully aware of the fact that in the circumastances now existing, it is not profitable for the Orissa province to take over the administration of the States, for it would be taking over a population of over 4½ millions and an area of over 25,000 square miles with a total revenue of just over a crore of rupees, which will naturally be reduced, perhaps considerably, if the proceeds of Central taxes and the Rulers' peronal allowances are excluded from it; We are further not oblivious of the fact that any attempt to bring the administration in the States to a resonable level of efficiency would strain the provincial administrative machinery to almost breaking point. Nevertheless, we feel that we would be justified in taking whatever financial and administrative risks there may be in a scheme of amalgamation in consideration of the factors we have mentioned above and the potentialities of the undeveloped parts of natural Orissa, and above all in the hope of building up a larger and more prosperous Oriya-speaking province which will be able to take its proper place among the united peoples of India.

10. We do not for a moment believe that with the present resources of the areas comprising the Orissa States a separate sub-province can be run with a separate legislature a separate executive and a separate administrative staff with any hope of maintaining resonable standards of efficiency. In case popular opinion in any part of natural Orissa demands some regional arrangements, we suggest that the regions for which separate administrative arrangements may appropriately be made should be not what are now, respectively, Orissa States and Orissa Province but the developed and undeveloped areas of the larger province. A large part of Ganjam and probably the whole of Koraput and Angul can quite suitably be included in the undeveloped region. For the administration of such regions we suggest the following constitutional plan with which may in due course be integrated whatever plan may be finally devised for administration of tribal areas—

(a) There should be a common legislature for both parts of the province with a single cabinet responsible to it.

(b) Some members of the cabinet would deal with subjects of common concern to all parts of the province and would in respect of these subjects exercise functions over the whole province.

(c) There would be a Minister or group of Ministers for the undeveloped region to deal with the other subjects for that region; similarly there would be another Minister or group of Ministers to deal with the same subjects for the developed region.

(d) Legislation relating exclusively to one of the two regions might by convention be committed exclusively to representatives of the affected region, representatives of the othes region refraining from taking any part in the proceedings at any stage.

To implement the above plan it is necessary to consider what should be deemed to be the subjects of common concern. We think at this stage, subject to a more critical examination of the matter perhaps by an expert committee of the Constituent Assembly, that they might well be

the subjects for which the Prime Minister of Orissa has been pressing for a common administration and in addition the following:—

(*a*) Provincial finance;

(*b*) public services and a common Public Service Commission;

(*c*) Elections;

(*d*) water-supplies, irrigation and canals, drainage and embankments, water-storage and water power;

(*e*) land including land tenures, relation of landlord and tenant and collection of rents, transfer, alienation and devolution of agricultural land, land improvement and agricultural loans, colonization, Courts of Wards, encumbered and attached estates Treasure, trov;

(*f*) provincial taxes such as sales tax, agricultural income-tax, taxes on luxuries, etc.

(*g*) regulation of mines and mineral development;

(*h*) land revenue including assessment and collection of revenue, maintenance of land records, survey of revenue purposes and records of rights and alienation of revenue.

11. To summarise or conclusions, we recommend—

(*i*) that the first step should be to guarantee the Rulers their dynastic succession, a generous privy purse, enjoyment in perpetuity of personal properties and certain well defined personal dignities and prerogatives. On the other hand, they should be completely divested of all political powers and administrative functions;

(*ii*) the new constitution should provide for accession of States ot specified provinces, and thereafter all the 26 Orissa States should formally accede to the Orissa province besids acceding to the Dominion for the purposes of the Dominion.

(*iii*) on such accession the administration of the States should be completely merged with the provincial administration, the Dominion subjects being taken over by the Dominion;

(*iv*) if regional arrangements are considered to be inevitable, they may be on the lines indicated in the last paragraph;

(*v*) till the new constitution is framed, interim arrangements may be made for common administration on the following lines. Either through supplementary Instruments of accession or through agreements, the States may delegate powers to the Government of India in regard to all subjects, the Dominion Government delegating in their turn to the province the necessary authority to administer the provincial subjects only. To help the Provincial Government to administer the subjects (other than what may be regarded as subjects of common concern), two popular representative from the Orissa States may be appointed as Advisers. The Advisers will advise the Provincial Government generally in regard to the policy to be followed in administering the States, and it is intended that in regard to those subjects which are not deemed to be subjects of common concern, they will be allowed to function, as far as possible, as Ministers for the Orissa States. It will have to be arranged of course that no major decisions are taken by the Advisers without the cognizance of the Cabinet. Further, in order to more effectively associate with the Administration popular opinion in the States, an Advisory Council may be set up in each State consisting of local popular representatives, either elected or nominated. It should not be difficult to arrange that the Advisers keep in constant touch with the local Advisory Councils and are, as far as practicable, guided by their advice and suggestions in purely local matters. Legally and constitutionally, however, the Provincial Government could during the interim period be responsible to the Dominion Government for the good administration of the areas comprised in the Orissa States. We are assuming, of course, that to the provincial exchequer will be credited receipts from all provincial sources of income, receipts from revenue in respect of Central subjects being credited to the Central Exchequer.

12. We would like to add that in case the Dominion Government decide on a policy of gradual integration in spite of our considered recommendations and the defects inherent in such a plan to which we have done our best to draw attention, we would be quite willing to give the plan a trial and our unstinted and loyal support. In that case, it would not naturally be our concern to solve the ticklish question as to which authority in the States or outside them would dminister the residuary subjects. We should, however, make it quite clear that if such partial administration by the Provincial Government is to have any reasonable chance of success, it is essential that the mininum quantum of subjects to be made over to the province for administration must be the subjects indicated by the Prime Minister at the Delhi conference, namely:—

(*i*) communications, that is, provincial and national highway;

(*ii*) education;

(*iii*) public health;

(*iv*) police excluding village police;

(*v*) public order and administration of Justice, civil, criminal and revenue and constitution and organization of all courts;

(*vi*) excise (including control of intoxicating liquors and narcotic drugs);

(*vii*) forests;

(*viii*) agriculture:

(ix) industries to which must be added' for obvious reasons; and

(x) prisons.

The above is the minimum quantum of subjects we would be prepared to take over; and we are,of course, quite prepared to take over in addition any other subjects in the sphere of provincial administration. As, however, we have already indicated, we fail to understand why land revenue should be the sole exception in case it is decided to delegate to the Provincial Government all subjects in the provincial legislative list.

13. It remains to consider the question of financial arrangements. The question presents no difficulty if the ultimate decision is to make over to the province the administration of all provincial subjects including the power to levy provincial taxes and fees. The Orissa State would then be administered in common with the

other parts of the provincee, the revenues derived from all parts would be credited to the provincial exchequer and all expenditure incurred by the provincial administration would be met from the common pool irrespective of the areas in respect of which the expenditure is incurred. In view, however, of the fact that still more backward areas would be added to a province which is perhaps already the most backward in India, it would, we expect, be necessary for the Provincial Government to ask for a larger subvention from the Centre than what they get at present. It would probably be easy enough to settle by negotiation the nature and amount of this additional subvention.

If, on the other hand, a specified number of subjects only are made over to the Provincial Government for administration, they would expect that they should be reimbursed the actual expenditure incurred by them in administering the ceded subjects. It would not, of course, be possible to keep an account of the expenditure incurred in each individual State, but we are advised that it should not be difficult to keep an account of the expenditure directly incurred by the Provincial Government on ceded subjects in the States, to which will have to be added, under different heads, a suitable share of the overhead charges of administration, e. g., a proportion of the salary of the Revenue Commisioner, of the Director of Public Instruction, of the Inspector-General of Police, etc., and their headquarters staff. The proportion of overhead charges to be debited to the States account can easily and appropriately be calculated on the basis of the population in the province and in the States respectively. The plan that would best suit the Provincial Government is that their actual expenditure on ceded subjects in the States, calculated in the manner explained above, should be reimbursed to them on an annual basis (such on-account advances being made to the province as may be necessary to help them maintain their ways and means position); and that the Central Government should thereafter recover the amount paid to the province from individual States in such manner as they may consider most appropriate. It would probably be quite fair to apportion the expenditure on the various States concerned according to their population or alternatively, on the basis of their income.

14. We should make it clear that our recommendations hold good irrespective of the number or class of States which integrate with our province for common administration, whether the integration be partial or gradual or complets. We do hold the view, of course, that from a practical point of view there is no need to distinguish between on State and another for purposes of any accepted merger scheme; and we further hold the view that the ideal should be to bring within the ambit of the merger scheme not only B and C class States but as many A class States as possible, and if possible all the Orissa States without any exception. All these States face to day precisely identical problems, and we are convinced that the future of all of them must necessarily be the same. None of them, not even Mayurbhanj, is big enough or populous enough or rich enough to bear the burden of a separate political entity as an autonomous unit of the Indian Union. At the same time we wish it to be understood that we are quite prepared to work a reasonable merger scheme, whether the merger be complete or partial, in respect of either all States or only selected States or only all B and C class States or even only some among them.

15. We append to our memorandum a factual and historical account of Orissa States prepared by an officer of the Orissa Government which provides the background against wihch our recommendations are formulated. We should not necessarily be taken to endorse all the views expressed in that account, but we can, we think, vouch for the accuracy of the facts and figures given in it.

CUTTACK
The 11th December 1947

B. C. MUKHARJI
Chief Secretary to Government

Extracts from book "THE STORY OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE INDIAN STATES" by Shri V. P. Menon, Reforms Commissioner to the Ministry of States, Government of India with regard to merger of Orissa States with the Province of Orissa. This will show that Dr. Mahtab did not suggest merger of States. His proposal of having some administrative arrangements was not accepted by the Ministry of States.



The author conferring with the rulers of A class States in Orissa, at Cuttack.



Sardar and the author being received by the Governor and Chief Minister of the Central Provinces at Nagpur.

The first problem to tackle was the future of the Eastern States Union. The Union was not homogeneous nor could it be justified on any consideration—linguistic, ethnical or geographical. The people of the Orissa States spoke Oriya and their affinities were with Orissa proper. The Chhattisgarh Sates, on the other hand, were inhabited by Hindi-speaking people: so their future obviously lay with the Central Provinces. Two of the most important States, as well as some smaller ones, had kept out of this Unon, which had no assured source of income (it was financed by contributions from the various constituent States which were in arrears); which totally ignored the people of the States, and which, in fact, was little more than a rules trade union. In these circumstances it was clearly impossible for the Government of India to recognize this Union.

If it were decided to dissolve the Eastern States Union, a possible alternative would be to form one Union of the Orissa States and another of the Chattisgarh States. But neither of these Unions would have the requisite resources to maintain a reasonable standard of administration. Moreover, the Orissa States had cut the province of Orissa into three bits and their formation into a Union would perpetuate that anomaly; while the Chattisgarh States were scattered all over the Central Province.

(With this alternative ruled out, the choice before us was either (1) to bring about a sort of administrative co-operation between the province and the States as suggested by Harekrushna Mahtab, or (2) to merge the Orissa States with the Orissa province and the Chhattisgarh States with the Central Provinces.

Althougb at first blush I was inclined to accept Harekrushna Mahtab's suggestion, it was found on examination to bristle with difficulties. His suggestion, if implemented, would be bound to create constant friction between the State authorities and the provincial government, so that the Government of India would have their hands full with arbitrating between these two authorities. The points in dispute being mainly administrative, no judicial tribunal would be in a position to arbitrate. The selection of subjects for common administration was bound to prove difficult, if not impossible. Equally thorny was the problem of fixing the basis of financial contribution to be made by the States for the subjects taken over by the provincial government. And, having made such contributions, would the States have enough resources left

to run the administration of the residuary subjects ?

I mentioned to Sardar the view of the Orissa Sub-Committee set up by the Simon Commission in 1929 and presided over by C. R. Attle. This Committee had suggested that, if Orissa were to be made into a separate entity, some arrangements should be made with the Orissa feudatory States for mutual relationship in administration. Sir Hawthorne Lewis, who possessed unrivalled knowledge and experience of Orissa and who later became the Governor of that province, had stated that the province of Orissa and the Orissa feudatory States could not be kept in water-tight compartments and both should have to be brought into some mutual relationship in administration. As late as 1940, the Secretary of State for India had himself envisaged that the Orissa States should ultimately have to become an integral part of the province of Orissa.

Sardar was quite definite that the Eastern States Union should not be recognized. He felt that a Union which was unrepresentative even in relation to the rulers and which paid no heed to the rights of the people had no justification to exist. He was opposed to the creation of two separate Unions of the Orissa States on the one hand and the Chaitsgarh States on the other.

As for Harekrushna Mahtab's proposals, it could only result in friction and bad government, it certainly did not contribute to the solution of the problem of the smaller States. Sardar was prepared to go all out to secure the merger of all three classes of Orissa Satates with the province of Orissa. He told me, however, that we should first tackle the 'B' and 'C' class State, and deal later with the 'A' class States. He asked me to invite all the rulers of the Orissa States to Cuttack for a discussion and to go there myself in the second week of December.

At the end of our discussion I pointed out to Sardar that the proposed merger of the States was contrary to the assurances held out in his own statement of 5 July and in Lord Mountbatten's address to the Chamber of Princes on 25 July 1947. It was true that, at that time, we were anxious by the policy of accassion on three subjects to preserve the integrity of the country, thus preventing the States from becoming so many 'Ulsters' in the body politic. Nevertheess, a guarantee once given could not be lightly set aside, unless it could be proved that there were overwhelming considerations which were demonstrably in the interests of the country. The fact of the matter was that we did not realize that the weakness in the States structure was the smaller States. While admitting the force of my arguments, Sardar felt he could not be a party to an attempt to perpetuate something that was inherently incapable of survival. The ultimate test of fitness for the survival of any State was its capacity to secure the well-being of its subjects. He was quite sure that the Orissa States rulers could not do this. Further, the compulsion of events had brought about altered circumstances and, by implementing their policy of merger, the Government of India would only be saving the rulers from the fury of their subjects newly awakened to a consciousness of their rights.

The States Ministry now concentrated on the problems likely to arise in the event of our being able to persuade the rulers of the Orissa States to merge their States with the province of Orissa. The first problem related to the privy purse of the rulers. Since they were surrendering their States for all time, it was but elementary justice that some from of **quid pro quo** should be conceded to them. We had before us the precedent set by the British Government who, in the process of establishing their empire, gave liberal pensions to those rulers who were deprived of their States. The Government of India have continued since to discharge some of these obligations. We considered that, in equity, these rulers should be given allowances (styled as Privy Purses) for their maintenance and that such allowances should not be terminated with the present rulers but should be continued to their successors.

As regards the basis on which the privy purse was to be fixed, we had two precedents to guide us. The first was the formula evolved by the Political Department in 1945 in consultation with a Sub-committee of the Chamber of Princes. This formula gave the rulers a privy purse on the basis of a percentage of the adverage revenues of the State for the previous five years. The percentages suggested were 25 per cent for all revenues up to Rs. 5 lakhs; 20 per cent for Rs. 5 lakhs to 10 lakhs; 15 per cent for Rs. 10 lakhs to 25 lakhs; 10 per cent for Rs. 25 lakhs to one crore; 7 per cent for the second crore; 5 per cent for the third core; 3 pe r cent for the fourth crore and an overall maximum of Rs. 25 lakhs for revenues above Ps. 4 crores.

The second precedent before us was the award of a Congress Sub-committee consisting of Dr Rajendra Prasad, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya and Shankarrao Deo in connexion with the formation of the Deccan States Union. This was known as the 'Deccan States Formula'. Under this formula, the rulers were to get privy purses at the rate of 15 per cent on the first Rs. 5 lakhs of the average annual revenue; 10 per cent on the next five lakhs and 7 1/2 per cent on revenue above Rs. 10 lakhs. The Deccan States formula did not fix a ceiling, but it provided a minimum of Rs. 50,000 per annum.

The Political Department's formula, we thought, was on to generous a scale, while the Deccan States, formula, though not so handsome, also erred on the liberal side. We felt that there should be a maximum privy purse; we were against fixing any minimum. In the formula that we devised (subsequently known as the Eastern States Formula) the rulesr were to get 15 per cent on the first lakh of the annual revenue; 10 per cent on the next Rs. 4 lakhs, and 7 1/2 per cent on all revenues above Rs. 5 lakhs, subject to a maximum of Rs.10 lakhs. The financial year 1945-46 was taken as the basic year for the calculation of the privy purse.

The rulers were already immune from taxation in their own States; unless, therefore, we made their allowances tax-free, we should be taking away with our left hand what we gave with the right. It was accordingly dicided that the privy purse would be free of all taxes.

We further conceced certain private properties, including palaces, and guaranteed the personal privileges of the ruler, his wife, his mother, the heir-apparent and his wife. Succession to the **gaddi** was also guaranteed. The basis idea was that Government of India should not create, as an aftermath of merger, any social or economic problems for the rulers or for their numerous dependents.

Another problem was whether the cessation of the rulers authority, jurisdiction and power should be in favour of the provincial government, or of the Government of India. There was a clear advatnage in the Centre taking over the States and then emplying the agency of the provincial governments for their administration; for then, at any rate until the new constitution was framed, the Government of India could retain control over the provincial governments in respect of the administration of those acres. It was obvious that, since the States and the districts in the province had to be welded into one unit, the help and guidance of the Central Government would be necessary. The Law Ministry produced a merger agreement embodying all our points in five articles, which served as a model for all such agreements made subsequently.

Sardar accepted the proposals and asked me to inform our Finance Minister as well as the Premier of Orissa about the basis and quantum of the privy purse. Both accepted the rates suggested as reasonable.

In the meantime, it was reported to us that cracks were developing in the Eastern States Union. We were told that, at a meeting of the Council of Rules, the Rajah of Khairagarh had presented a note favouring full and unconditional co-operation with the neighbouring provinces, including, if necessary, the merger of the States. The rulers of Korea and Patna were wholly opposed to the suggestion. Many of the rulers of the smaller States held the view that each should decided for himself, take his own course and scrap the Eastern States Union. As a last minute endeavour to save the Union and to obtain recognition from the State Ministry, the rules of Korea and Patna came to Delhi on 1 December bringing with them the ruler of Khairagarh. They met Sardar the same day. He pointed out to them that the fate of the 'B' and 'C' class States was inextricably bound up with the adjoining provinces and that they could not stand on their own feet. The Oriya-speaking States must be integrated with Orissa and the Hindi-speaking States with the Central Provinces. Sadrar was emphatic that the Eastern States Union should be dissolved. He said that suitable machinery should be evolved for joint administration of certain subjects between 'A' class State and the province. As the rules were to meet at Cuttack quite soon, this question could be discussed then.

After this meeting, Sardar and I again reviewed the position I pointed out that joint administration on certain subjects between 'A' class States and the province was fraught with innumerable administrative difficulties. It was for this reason that we had rejected a similar proposal by Harekrushna Mahtab with regard to 'B' and 'C' class State. I could not conceive a half-way house between the **status quo** and a complete merger of the 'A' class States with the province.

A few days before I was to leave for Cuttack, Sardar told me that he would also be coming. This change in the original programme caused me some misgiving; for I had thought that if I failed to bring about the merger, whether partial or complete, Sardar could then have tried his hand as the higher authority, but that if the two of us went together and failed to accomplish anything the entire plan would collapse. Our success or failure at Cuttack was bound to have a great psychological effect on rulers all over India; and we could not therefore risk a failure. A former official of the Political Department had warned me not to deal with Orissa first as the rulers were supposed to be intractable. But the situation in Orissa was clamouring for immediate attention and we had no alternative but to tackle. it. Sardar had made up his mind and there was no use my arguing this matter with him. Accordingly on 13 December we went to Cuttack.

On reaching Cuttack, we had a meeting with the provincial ministers as well as the Governor, I explained to them the tentative plan we had in mind. There was some discussion. In the end it was decided not only that the 'B' and 'C' class States should be amalgamated with the province of Orissa, but that the 'A' class States also should be tackled in the same way.

We took the rulers in two batches. The conference of 'B' and 'C' class States' rulers took place at 10 a.m. on 14 December 1947. The rulers of Athgarh, Baramba, Daspalla, Hindol, Khandapara, Kharaswan, Narsinghpur, Nilgiri, Pal-Lahara, Rairakhol, Ranpur and Talcher were present, as well as the Rajmata of Ranpur. On our side, there were Sardar, Harekrushna Mahtab, K. V. K. Sundaram, I.C.S., of the Law Ministry, the Regional Commissioner for the Eastern States, V. Sankar, I.C.S., Sardar's Private Secretary, and my self, besides the Revenue Commissioner and the Chief Secretary of Orissa.

Sardar inaugurated the proceedings with a most persuasive speech. He said that the safety of the rulers as well as of the people was in danger in Orissa, and that the situation demanded immediate solution. He had come to Cuttack to tender friendly advice to the rulers, not as a representative of the old paramountcy or of any foreign power, but as a member of a family trying to solve a family problem. Orissa as a federal unit could only thrive and progress if it was a compact whole and was not torn as under by multifarious jurisdictions and authorities which ruined its compactness. These States had no resources, no man power, and nothing on which any stable government could be built up; obviously therefore they could not work responsible government. There had been a parrot cry of late in India for responsible government in the States; and some rulers had used one section of the population against another to maintain their position. Responsible government in petty States had no meaning. He advised the rules to cease exposing themselves as targets in these troublous-times and to divest themselves of all power and authority. The Government of India would, in their turn, guarantee the privileges, honour and dignity of such rulers. The growing discontent among the people cried out for an immediate remedy. He concluded that if his advice were not listened to, the rulers, after being ousted by their people, would have in the end to come to Delhi; by which time things might have gone so far that he would no longer be in a position to help them.

We gave the rulers copies of our draft agreement for merger. There was some desultory discussion, during which the young Rajah of Ranpur said that he had already granted responsible government. But Sardar pooh-poohed the idea of responsible government in such petty States. The Rajah then enquired whether he could stand for election to the Orissa Legislative Assembly. Sardar replied in the affirmative and added, in characteristic fashion, that instead of diving in a narrow well, the ruler would be entitled to swim in an ocean. The main part of the discussions turned on the privy purses. I explained how these amounts were fixed. There was a strong demand that they should be increased. Sardar was firm and said that if the privy purses were to be settled in perpetuity, he did not wish them to be fixed so high as to become a target of attack. The rulers asked for some time to consider the agreement. But it was only a formal request. They realized that their continued existence depended on the good will of their people and the support of the Government of India, both of which they lacked and that if, owing to agitation the administration of their States were ultimately taken over by the Government of India they might not even get the privy purse which was now being guaranteed to them. That same evening I met the rulers again. Sardar was not present at this discussion. Ultimately the twelve rulers agree to the merger and signed the agreement. It was decided to ask the rulers of the remaining three States who had been prevented from attending by illness, or for other reasons, to sign later.

After lunch on 14 December, we met the rulers of the 'A' class States of Bamra, Baudh, Dhenkanal, Gangpur, Kalahandi, Keonjhar, Mayurbhanj, Nayagarh, Patna, Seraikela and Sonepur. Sardar explained the position to them on the same lines as he had done to the rulers of the 'B' and 'C' class s ates. He told them that the Orissa States were like ulcers on the body of the province and that they must either be cured or eliminated. If they listened to his advice they could be cured; otherwise they might find themselves uprooted by the people.

The Maharajah of Mayurbhanj said that he had already granted responsible grovernment in his State and that a ministry was functioning. Hence he could not make any commitment without consulting his ministers. In view of this and having regard to the area, population and revenue of the State, he was left out of the discussions.

The Maharajah of Patna (who was the spokesman for the rest of the rulers) said that while accepting the need for collaboration with the provincial government, the rulers did not agree with the suggestion in the draft agreement circulated to them that the transfer of all powers to the province was the right solution. Assurances were then asked from us on such points as the maintenance of the territorial integrity of the States, representation of the people and the rulers in the regislature, private properties, palace guards, security of permanent services, privileges and exemptions and so on. We were extremely accommodating in our attitude, except on the question on privy purses. Here we firmly refused to depart from the principle adopted in the case of the 'B' and 'C' class States.

As the discussions proceeded, it became, clear that the rulers of the 'A' class States wee not agreeable to the proposal for merger. The Maharajah of Patna wanted time for further consideration. Sardar almost lost his patience at this and said that if the friendly advice which he tendered was not acceptable and the problem remained as before, he could not answer for the consequences. I then sugeested that the rulers chould consider the agreement for a few hours and that we might meet again at ten that night. They agreed and the conference was adjourned.

Sardar was very much disappointed with the attitude of the rulers. As we were leaving the Conference room someone remarked that it would not be difficult to foment unrest and make the position of the rulers intolerable. I observed that were we to sow the wind of unrest the country would reap the whirlwind of choas. I went on to say that if the choice before us was peace with the sta us quo or choas with merger, I would unhesitatingly vote for the former. The need of the hour was peace. Sardar agreed with me.

At ten O' Clock that night, the rulers of eight 'A' class States met me Sardar was not present, nor was Harekrushna Mahtab. At the outset, the Maharajah of Patna pointed out that the merger agreement did not tally with the talks he had had with Sardar in Delhi. I replied that the mere collaboration on five or six subjects between the States and the provincial government, which was all that had been discussed in Delhi, did not by any means solve the problem. I repeated the arguments against this sort of arrangement and emphasized that the integration of all Orissa States with the province was essential for the peace and progress both of the States and of the province. The Maharajah of Patna then made the suggestion that there should be a federation of the States with the province on certain specified subjects, and that for the rest the States should be treated as autonomous units. I pointed out the paractical difficulties that were inherent in the proposition and the friction it would create between the provincial legislature and government on the one hand and the federal and State authorities on the other. I enquired in what way such a cumbrous arrangement would benefit the people of the States. I told the Maharajah that, even under his scheme, the subjects which were left to the States would still have to be administered in responsibility to a legislature. If that was the position, it would be in the interests of both the rulers and the people to agree to the proposal of the Government of India. The Maharajah then explained that, as the rulers were signatories to the Estern State Union Constitution, it was obviously necessary for them to examine the legal position as to how best they could withdraw from it before signing the merger agreement. He asked for time and the meeting was adjuurned.

It was now midnight and Sardar was leaving the next morning for Nagpur. If no agreement were reached with

the rulers of the 'A' class States before he left, there was every likelihood that their attitude later would stiffen. And failure with these rulers would affect disastrously our negotiations with the Chattisgarh rulers whom we were to meet the next day. Indeed, all our plans would go away unless something was done to bring round these rulers.

I took the Rajah of Dhenkanal into my confidence. He was an important 'A' class ruler; but in view of the Praja-mandal agitation for responsible government he cold not maintain his position inside his State without the support of the Government of India. He readily agreed to the merger of his State when I promised him that, in that event, all his demands, such as were considered reasonable, would be conceded. I then requested him to go and inform the Maharajah of Patna and others of his decision to merge his State with Orissa, adding that if they did not follow his example the Government of India would be compelled, in the conditions prevailing in Orissa, to take over the administration of their States.

The Rajah of Dhenkanal must have conveyed the message, for the Maharajah of Patna came to me in the very early hours of the morning. We had a frank talk. I pointed out to him that law and order had practically broken down in Dhenkanal and that other States were on the brink of trouble. While admitting that his State was at the time free from it, I told the Maharajah that it would not be long before the agaitation spread to his State. In the general unrest I was certain that unsocial elements would take a hand. The situation in northern India could not be unknown to him. If the rulers would not realize their responsibilities the Government of India could not forget theirs. Rather than allow the peace of the province to be endangered, the Government of India would go to the length of even taking over the administration of the States. The carying need of the hour was peace. The Maharajah asked me whether the Government of India were really serious about taking over the administration of the States and whether I would put this down in writing. I told him that, in the circumstances explained by me, the Government of India would have no option but to do so and that I would certainly record as much in writing.

After this discussion, the Maharajah of Patna brought in the other rulers. We then began consideration of the agreement clause by clause. The rulers of Patna, Seraikela, Gangpur and Sonepur gave me a memorandum containing a list of their demands. These were : (1) that the Orissa Legislature should be bicameral and that in the Upper House the rulers of the twenty-six Orissa States or their successors should be permanent members; (2) that the terms of succession of the rulers should continue to be the same as in the Instrument of Accession signed by them in August 1947; (3) that the privy purse of the rulers should be fixed in perpetuity and guaranteed on the same uniform basis and principle as would be the case with other larger States, and (4) that the personal rights and prerogatives of the rulers as heretofore enjoyed should continue. I retained the memorandum but told the rulers that it would be difficult for the Government of India to accede to all their demands.

The rulers then raised points regarding their private properties and personal privileges, and security from victimization of State servants on account of their past loyalty. I accepted several amendments to the merger aggrement in as conciliatory a spirit as possible. Some of the proposals I deferred until the views of the Government of Orissa could be obtained. In the hearing of all those present, I dictated a letter to the Chief Secretary of Orissa asking for the views of the provincial government and emphasizing that the Government of India desired the proposals of the rulers of 'A' class States on these points to be met as far as possible. After this, there was no further difficulty and the rulers of Baudh, Dhenkanal, Gangpur, Kalahandi, Patna, Seraikela and Sonepur put their signatures to the merger agreement. The original copies which had been signed by the rulers were so full of corrections and amendments that they looked like galley proofs after correction by the proof reador. We had no time to get the agreement retyped.

After the rulers had signed the agreement, I gave the following letter to the Maharajah of Patna as promised :

I am glad that you have signed the agreement. I mentioned to you the peculiar position which your State occupies among the Orissa States. The Government of India are most anxious to maintain law and order. We cannot allow your State to create problems for the Government of Orissa and if you had not signed the agreement, we would have been compelled to take over the administration of your State.

The rulers of Baudh and Kalahandi asked me for similar letters, which I gave them.

The rulers and I had been in almost continuous session from ten o' clock of the previous night to about nine in the morning of the 15th. Sardar and his party had gone to the railway station and were waiting for me, but it was more than two hours before I was able to join them. Sardar was very pleased when I handed him the merger agreement signed by the rulers of the 'A' class States. Harekrushna Mahtab even presented me with a silver filigree cigaratte case as a memento of the occasion. I told Sardar about the letter I had given to some of the rulers which I felt might occasion some criticism, but Sardar assured me that there was no need to worry.

We then left for Bhubaneswar and from there flew to Nagpur.

———